

Alcuin's life of Martin is a redaction of three works by SULPICIUS SEVERUS on the Saint, his *VITA*, *DIALOGORUM LIBRI III*, and *EPISTULAE*. The Cambridge MS suggests that the work may have first circulated in England in the *HOMILIARY OF ST PÈRE DE CHARTRES*, and was added later to the *COTTON-CORPUS LEGENDARY* (see *LEGENDARIES*) represented by the Salisbury MS. Zettel (1979 pp 99–110) first noted ÆLFRIC's use of this work in his first life of St Martin, identifying the four major passages previously thought to have come from Sulpicius's *Dialogues* as deriving more directly from Alcuin's redaction. He discusses as well some other correspondences.

For a discussion of Alcuin's sources, see I Deug-Su (1983 pp 167–72); and for an analysis of Ælfric's change in attitude to this source, see Biggs (forthcoming).

Frederick M. Biggs

APOCRYPHA

The term "Apocrypha" is used here instead of "Pseudepigrapha" because the perspective of this volume is not exactly the same as that of modern scholars who distinguish among three kinds of biblical material: books accepted as canonical by Catholics and Protestants (from the Hebrew canon), additional books accepted by Catholics but not by Protestants (from the Septuagint canon), and books excluded by both groups. For Anglo-Saxon England, where the Bible was essentially the Vulgate (see *BIBLE*), it is more appropriate to distinguish between the Bible as the canon and the Apocrypha as the non-canonical books, a distinction suggested by the contemporary writers ALDHELM (the prose *DE VIRGINITATE* 313.11–14), BEDE (*RETRACTIO IN ACTUS APOSTOLORUM* I.13.56), and FRITHEGOD (*BREVILOQUIUM VITAE WILFRIDI* 1210–11; for patristic uses, see *NTA* 1.25–26). The use of the term, however, is not meant to imply that the advances in modern scholarship in dating, placing, and characterizing these texts will be ignored.

Unfortunately, deciding which term to use is less difficult than defining what it means. While useful, the definitions of modern scholars—in particular Charlesworth (*OTP* 1.xxv) and Hennecke (*NTA* 1.26–28)—are perhaps too strict for our purposes because they exclude works that would have appeared to be "Apocrypha" to the Anglo-Saxons. For example, the *REVELATIONES* of PS METHIDIUS, now dated to the mid seventh century and so too late for Charlesworth's criteria, is in some ways similar to Daniel. Thus for practical purposes, this section adopts the inclusive list of

Apocrypha in volume 1—and expanded in volume 8—of the *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi* [*RBMA*]. This list also provides a convenient system of dividing the works into Old Testament Apocrypha, Apocryphal Gospels, Apocryphal Acts, and Apocryphal Apocalypses; the Apocryphal Gospels and the Apocryphal Acts have their own introductory remarks. The section includes a few texts not listed in the *RBMA* but which are often considered with the Apocrypha. An example is the *BIBLICAL ANTIQUITIES* of PS PHILO, which, following the *OTP*, has been included with the Old Testament Apocrypha even though the *RBMA* treats the work as a biblical commentary. A concluding Miscellaneous section, which has been omitted from this "Trial Version," will include several texts that do not fit neatly into the scheme but that are discussed by Anglo-Saxonists as Apocrypha.

There is considerable overlapping within apocryphal books, which of course increases the difficulty of establishing which were known in Anglo-Saxon England. For example, as Cross (1979b p 17) notes, the PS ABDIAS collection of Apocryphal Acts, which has been cited as a source for works such as the Old English *Martyrology* [*Mart*, B19], draws on earlier lives, and so is often indistinguishable from them. Moreover recent studies of Hiberno-Latin biblical materials (see *HIBERNO-LATIN BIBLICAL COMMENTARIES*; Bischoff 1976; McNamara 1975; Cross 1986a; and C. Wright 1987a) indicate that many apocryphal motifs circulated in these works, and so an individual motif may not necessarily reflect a direct knowledge of the entire book in question.

Contributors to the Apocrypha have signed their individual entries, but all have read the entire section, and have been generous in offering advice and criticism. The unsigned entries are my own. For further scholarship on the texts themselves, see Charlesworth's bibliographies for works related to the Old Testament (1981) and to the New Testament (1987).

Frederick M. Biggs

I. OLD TESTAMENT APOCRYPHA

Life of Adam and Eve [ANON.Vit.Adae]: *RBMA* 74; *OTP* 2.249–95.

MSS—*Refs* none.

Surviving in distinct Greek (sometimes called the Apocalypse of Moses) and Latin recensions, the Life of Adam and Eve was composed—probably in Hebrew—late in the first century AD, and translated probably before the beginning of the fifth century (*OTP* 2.252). The Latin version relates events in the life of Adam and Eve from the expulsion to their deaths.

Pächt (1961 p 169) suggests that the illumination in the illustrated Old English Hexateuch (BL Cotton Claudius B.iv; *IASIM* 191.17) of an angel instructing Adam and Eve in tilling the earth after the Fall is related to this apocryphon. The other possibility, JUBILEES 3.15, is less likely since here Adam and Eve are instructed before the Fall. The illumination is reproduced in *EEMF* 18, and discussed on pp 19 and 65.

Groos (1983) cites Satan's account of his expulsion from heaven as a possible source for the question of angelic seniority in *Guthlac A* (*GuthA*, A3.2; 4b). Evans (1968 p 146 note 4) suggests that this account may underlie Lucifer's explanation of his rebellion in *Christ and Satan* (*Sat*, A1.4; 84-86).

For a list of the Latin MSS, see Halford (1981). For a discussion of the Hiberno-Latin material, see C. Wright (1987a pp 130-33).

Adam Octipartite and Adam's Name [ANON.Adam.comp.]: *RBMA* 75,22.

MSS 1. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 326: HG 93.

2. Durham, Cathedral Library A.IV.19: HG 223.

Lists none.

A-S Vers *Sol I* (B5.1).

Quots/Cits—Refs none.

The motif that describes Adam's creation from eight substances may rest ultimately on II Enoch 30.8J (*OTP* 1.150). It is widespread in Insular circles, appearing in the eighth-century *LIBER DE NUMERIS* (in *HIBERNO-LATIN BIBLICAL COMMENTARIES*, number 39; see also the *QUESTIONS OF BARTHOLOMEW*) and later texts. The *DURHAM RITUAL* (p 192; see *LITURGY*) has an Old English gloss (*DurRitGlCom*, C13.1). This motif occurs in questions 8 and 9 of the prose *Solomon and Saturn* (*Sol I*); see Cross and Hill (1982, 26.8-18), and their discussion of sources and analogs (pp 68-70).

Along with the description of Adam's material creation in the Cambridge MS is another motif also perhaps derived from II Enoch 30.13-14J (*OTP* 1.152; also mentioned in the *SIBYLLINE ORACLES* 3.24-26: *OTP* 1.362), the derivation of Adam's name from four stars. This motif underlies questions 6 and 7 of the prose *Solomon and Saturn* (see Cross and Hill 1982 pp 66-67), but does not occur in the Durham Ritual. A version of the motif, which links the names to the four corners of the world but does not mention stars, occurs in *BEDE* (*COMMENTARIUS IN GENESIM* II.729-33); Bede apparently follows *AUGUSTINE* (*ENARRATIONES* XCV.15.6-12) or *AUGUSTINE* (*TRACTATUS* IX.14.9-14 and X.12.2-12). D'Alverny (1976 p 169) notes a trace of this motif in one of the illuminations in Byrhtferth's *Manual* (*ByrM* 1, Crawford, B20.20.1), printed as the frontispiece in *EETS* OS 177: the cardinal points are also given the names that spell out Adam, and reinforced with separate capitals.

In addition to the text specified in the Bibliography Part I, Förster (1907-08) prints other versions. For further references to Hiberno-Latin and Irish texts, see McNally (1957 p 72), McNamara (1975 p 21-23), Tristram (1975), and C. Wright (1987a pp 140-43). Hill (1977a) cites the theme as relevant to the "Æcerbot Charm" (*MCharm* 1, A43.1). See also Cerbelaud (1984) for a general discussion of the theme.

Jubilees [ANON.Jubilees]: *RBMA* 77; *OTP* 2.35-142. See *LIFE OF ADAM AND EVE* and *I ENOCH*.

MSS—Quots/Cits none.

Refs see below.

Composed in Hebrew in the middle of the second century BC, Jubilees (also known as the "Little Genesis") recounts stories from Genesis and the beginning of Exodus. A single fragmentary Latin MS survives (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana C 73 inf.; *CLA* 3.316), which contains about a fourth of the work. The work is mentioned by *JEROME* (*EPISTOLA AD FABIOLOM* [78] 68.14-17), and condemned in the *GELASIAN DECREE* (286). Bischoff (1976 p 77) notes that it is cited twice in the glosses of *THEODORE OF CANTERBURY* in Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana M. 79 sup., a work being edited by Bischoff and Lapidge.

An English translation, based primarily on the Ethiopic but referring to the Hebrew, Latin, and Syriac fragments, is in *OTP* 2.52-142. Charles' edition (Bibliography Part I) places the Latin fragments opposite the Ethiopic text.

Ps Philo, Biblical Antiquities [ANON.Lib.Antiq./PS.PHILO]: *RBMA* 4.6980,2; *OTP* 2.297-377.

Ogilvy (*BKE* pp 69-73) indirectly refers to this work, which was composed in Hebrew in the first century BC, when he discusses four fragments, the "Prayer of Moses," the "Vision of Kenaz," the "Lamentation of Seila the daughter of Jephthah," and the "Song of David," printed by James (1893 pp 166-85) from Phillipps MS 391; Cohn (1898) recognized the fragments to be from the *Biblical Antiquities*. The MS is listed in the 30 Nov. 1965 sale catalog of Sotheby & Co. (*Bibliotheca Phillippica* 1965), as from the second half of the eleventh century (early twelfth century in Kisch 1949 p 27) and from the Abbey of St Matthias, Trier. Thus there is currently no evidence for the knowledge of this work in Anglo-Saxon England.

I Enoch [ANON.Enoch]: *RBMA* 78,16; *OTP* 1.5-89.

MSS London, BL Royal 5.E.xiii: HG 459.

Lists—A-S Vers none.

Quots/Cits ? BEDA.Comm.epist.cath. 340.226–27: see below.

Refs BEDA.Comm.epist.cath. 340.220.

This composite work, attributed to Enoch (Gen 5.24) but composed in Hebrew or Aramaic between 200 BC and 100 AD, presents eschatological themes, discussion of the fallen angels, and astronomical lore. The only known Latin fragment is a shortened version of chapter 106 (considered in the *OTP* to be an appendix from an independent work), which describes Moses' miraculous form at birth, and foretells the Flood. Milik (1976 pp 78–81), who argues that "there is no irrefutable evidence for the existence of a Latin version of the Enochic writings," proposes that the fragment and its surrounding passages are "probably some extracts from a chronicle or from a collection of Exempla or of Testimonia." Dumville (1973) identifies the manuscript as Breton from the ninth century, but states that it "was in England (perhaps Worcester) during the next century" (p 331).

According to Kaske (GR 2343), BEDE's discussion in his COMMENTARIUS IN EPISTOLAS OF I Enoch "is clearly based on a similar discussion by AUGUSTINE IN DE CIVITATE DEI" (XV.23.104–24), but "it does at least raise the question of whether Bede may not have known of the Book of Enoch directly" (p 422). The passage Kaske cites as suggesting independent knowledge by Bede is referred to I Enoch 6–7 in the CCSL edition of Bede's commentary, although Augustine may be Bede's only source.

As evidence for the circulation of I Enoch, James (1909–10) has identified a number of early Insular works that include the motif of the seven archangels: Cuthbert's coffin; the DURHAM RITUAL (pp 145, 146, and 198; see LITURGY); the BOOK OF CERNE (p 153; see LITURGY); the ANTIPHONARY OF BANGOR (p 85; see LITURGY); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41 (p 326; HG 39); and the *Textus Roffensis* (EEMF 7 fol 116v); as well as several other Irish and Continental examples. Hill (1974) adds that some of the names from the list occur in the *Pater Noster Dialogue* (Sol II, B5.3; 169.3 and 9) and that BONIFACE condemns a prayer containing the names of eight angels (MGH.ES 1.117). Cross (1986a) discusses the possibility of Irish biblical commentaries as intermediaries for such material (see McNally 1959 p 28 for a further Irish example).

Menner (GR 4337) cites I Enoch three times for parallels to the poetic *Solomon and Saturn* (MSol, A13; 247a–48b; 253b, and 263–64). The possibility that I Enoch may underlie the depiction of Grendel and Grendel's mother in *Beowulf* (Beo, A4.1) has long intrigued critics, with three details commanding the most attention: the monsters' cannibalism, their home in the wasteland, and the "el" ending of Grendel's name; see in particular Bousterwek (GR 2713, p 401), Emerson (GR 623, p 878 note 1); Kaske (GR

2343), Peltola (GR 2353); Mellinkoff (1979 and 1981); and Cross (1986a pp 82–83).

Two of the illuminations of Enoch, one in the Old English Hexateuch (BL, Cotton Claudius B.iv.; *IASIM* 191.35) and another in the Junius MS (Oxford, Bodleian Library Junius 11; *IASIM* 163.35), illustrate Gen 5.24, the translation of Enoch, and show no apparent influence of the apocryphal tradition. A second illustration in the Junius MS, however, is less straightforward, showing "Enoch, nimbed and holding an open book, trampil[ing] a dragon, while an angel addresses him" (*IASIM* 163.34). Neither the Vulgate, nor *Genesis A* (GenA, A1.1; 1195–1217a) accounts for this depiction; Gollancz (GR 136, p xlv) suggests it may represent Enoch as the inventor of writing (JUBILEES 4.18) or as the author of an apocryphal book (see I Enoch 13.6, 14.7, etc.). Similarly, Gollancz suggests that the sign above the family inhabiting the first city earlier in the Hexateuch (*IASIM* 191.22) is the sign of Aries, and can be explained by assuming a confusion of Cain's son Enoch (Gen 4.17) and Jared's son Enoch (Gen 5.19): the latter, according to JUBILEES 4.17 composed an astronomical text. According to Milik (1976 p 11) this passage from Jubilees refers to I Enoch 72–82.

A translation of the entire work, based on the Ethiopic but including references to the Greek and Latin fragments, appears in *OTP* 1.13–89. The Greek fragments are edited by Black (1970 pp 19–44). In addition to editing the Latin fragment, James (Bibliography Part I, pp 146–50), discusses the work.

Oratio Moysis: (RBMA 89,7); see PS PHILO, BIBLICAL ANTIQUITIES.

Jamnes and Mambres [ANON.Jamnes]: RBMA 89,13; *OTP* 2.427–42.

MSS London, BL Cotton Tiberius B.v: HG 373.

Lists none.

A-S Vers Mambres (B8.5.7).

Quots/Cits—Refs none.

Legends about Jamnes and Mambres (Greek: Jannes and Jambres), at some point identified as the two Egyptian magicians who compete against Moses and Aaron in Ex 8, are pre-Christian since they are alluded to in the Damascus Document, a text dated around 100 BC (*OTP* 2.427). The *OTP* notes that "most early development of the Jannes and Jambres tale took place in a Greek (and Latin) Christian milieu," with early references to the two including II Tim 3.8. By the third century, ORIGEN refers to an apocryphon devoted to their exploits (Commentary on Mt 27.9, PG 13.1769), and a Latin version is condemned by the GELASIAN DECREE (303–04).

The Latin excerpt and Old English translation from the British Library MS were printed by Cockayne (GR 293) and James (GR 5734), and then more carefully edited and discussed by Förster (GR 5735). The Old English translation, amounting to some 15 lines and accompanied by a full page illustration, is the only vernacular version that has yet come to light. In it, Mambres raises the spirit of his dead brother Jamnes from hell with the aid of necromancing spells in Jamnes' magical books. The shade of Jamnes appears and warns Mambres of hell's torments, adjuring him to lead a better life. Comparison with the reconstructed Greek fragments shows this episode to come near the end of the apocryphon (*OTP* 2.440–41). The excerpt has apparently been added on to the *MARVELS OF THE EAST*.

Three other passages in Old English mention the magicians by name but are not manifestly dependent upon the apocryphon. One of the Old English additions to *Orosius* (*Or*, B9.2; 26.19–22) tells that by means of sorcery, "Geames and Mambres" persuaded the Egyptians to follow the Israelites through the Red Sea. Nothing in the extant Greek fragments agrees with this assertion; see however ISIDORE'S ETYMOLOGIES (VII.vi.44–45) which connects the two names with the sea, and may thus have given rise to the addition. ÆLFRIC makes a similar comment in his piece on auguries (*ÆLS*, Auguries, B1.3.18; 114) where he states that Jamnes and Mambres made many pronouncements through the devil's craft, deceiving Pharaoh with their cunning tricks so that he drowned in the deep sea. Finally, the anonymous *Life of St Margaret* (*LS* 14 [MargaretAss 15]; B3.3.14; 258) records that when God cast Satan out of paradise, he gave him two lands (presumably to rule), one named Jamnes and the other Mambres. This detail accords with none of the extant Latin lives of St Margaret (*BHL* 5303), which do mention Jamnes and Mambres, but only in a speech in which a demon proclaims, "Satan is our king, who was expelled from paradise. In the books of Jamnes and Mambres you will find our lineage [recorded]" (Mombritius 1910 vol 2 p 194). The precise relationship of these three Old English passages to the apocryphon, or related legends, has yet to be determined.

Jamnes and Mambres also have been identified in three illuminations. The illustrated Old English Hexateuch (BL Cotton Claudius B.iv; *IASIM* 191) depicts the miracle of the rods (*Ex* 7.12) with two figures between Moses and Aaron and Pharaoh; although the text does not identify them, Ohlgren's (*IASIM* 191.252) suggestion that they are Jamnes and Mambres seems likely. Two similar figures appear in the depiction of the plague of lice (*Ex* 8.18), and again Ohlgren (191.258) identifies them as Jamnes and Mambres. BL Cotton Tiberius B.v (see above) depicts the scene described in the fragment (*IASIM* 192.62).

For an English translation of the extant fragments in Greek, Latin, and Old English, see *OTP* 2.437–42; on the texts themselves, see the introduc-

tion to the translation, with further bibliography in Charlesworth (1981 pp 133–34). The Toronto *Dictionary of Old English* is using Förster's edition (GR 5735). Further discussion of the Old English appears in James (1920 pp 31–38).

Thomas N. Hall

Threnis Seilae Iepthedis in Monte Stelaco: *RBMA* 89,16. See *PS PHILO*, BIBLICAL ANTIQUITIES.

Visio Zenez: *RBMA* 91,4. See *PS PHILO*, BIBLICAL ANTIQUITIES.

4 Ezra [ANON.Esdrae.lib.IV]: *RBMA* 95; *OTP* 1.516–59.

MSS—*Refs* none.

Composed in the late first century AD, with four chapters added in the third century, 4 Ezra contains seven visions concerning primarily the end of the world. The work circulated in some Latin Bibles (for a list of early manuscripts, see Gry 1938 vol 1 pp xi–xiii); and was certainly known in Irish circles (see McNamara 1975 p 27). Ogilvy concludes too readily from a passage quoted in James' introduction to Bensly's (1895) edition that "the French family of MSS are thought to rest on an English archetype" (*BKE* p 69). According to Bischoff (1968 p 24), the manuscript in question (now Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 11504 and 11505) is from St Germain in Paris, although the illuminated initials may show the influence of Insular practice. McNamara (1975) indicates that one of the Irish texts dependent on 4 Ezra belongs to the French family.

A number of motifs perhaps derived ultimately from 4 Ezra have been noted in Old English texts, particularly *ChristC* (A3.1; see GR 626, 3265, Hill 1986, Biggs 1986, and Biggs 1989; see also *HIBERNO-LATIN COMMENTARIES*, NUMBER 1).

For an English translation, see *OTP* 1.525–59. In addition to the text in Bensly and James (1895), the introduction includes a list of patristic and medieval citations of the work. See also Gry's (1938) study and edition, which contains French translations of the Syriac and Ethiopic, and a Latin text with many variants. On the relationship of 4 Ezra to other Ezra material, see Stone (1982).

Revelatio Esdrae [ANON.Rev.Esd.]: *RBMA* 99.

MSS 1. London, BL Cotton Titus D.xxvi: HG 380.

2. London, BL Cotton Tiberius A.iii: HG 363.

Lists none.

A-S Vers 1. *Prog* 3.9 (Först; B23.3.3.9).

2. *Prog* 5.1 (Warner; B23.3.5.1).

3. *Prog* 6.4 (Cockayne; B23.3.6.4).

Quots/Cits—Refs none.

The *Revelatio Esdrae*, which predicts the weather for the coming year on the basis of the weekday on which the new year falls, is closer in genre to the *PROGNOSTICA* than to the *Apocrypha*; it is, however, associated with *Ezra* in the seventh-century *Chronicle* of John of Nikion, and in Latin MSS such as Vatican, Pal. lat. 1449 (Mercati, Bibliography Part I). The two eleventh-century MSS in the BL (printed in Birch 1892 pp 257–58; and Förster, GR 6152, pp 296–97) do not associate the work with *Ezra*. The work also occurs in Vatican, Pal. lat. 235, but beyond the portion of this manuscript accepted in HG 910.

In addition to the glossed Latin text, Cotton Tiberius A.iii also includes a version only in Old English (*Prog* 3.9). The other two Old English versions are from the twelfth century. *Prog* 6.4, unlike the other versions known in Anglo-Saxon England, associates the predictions with Christmas rather than with the new year; this tradition is also found in London, BL Sloane 475, a MS not included in HG, but dated by Matter (1982 p 389) to the eleventh century.

Matter (1982) pays special attention to the English transmission of the work, and also provides a translation of the Latin. In addition to the Latin texts printed by Mercati (Bibliography Part I), a version appears in *PL* 90.951 among the doubtful works of Bede.

Psalm 151 [ANON.Ps.151]: *RBMA* 105,2; *OTP* 2.610–12.

MSS 1. Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana 1 (Amiatinus): HG 825.

2. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 272: HG 77.

3. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 391: HG 104.

4. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 411: HG 106.

5. London, BL Additional 37517: HG 291.

6. London, BL Arundel 60: HG 304.

7. London, BL Cotton Galba A.xviii: HG 334.

8. London, BL Cotton Vespasian A.1: HG 381.

9. London, BL Cotton Vitellius E.xviii: HG 407.

10. London, BL Harley 2904: HG 430.

11. London, Lambeth Palace Library 427: HG 517.

12. Salisbury, Cathedral Library 150: HG 740.

13. Salisbury, Cathedral Library 180: HG 754.

14. Vatican, Reg. Lat 12: HG 912.

Lists—Refs none.

Composed originally in Hebrew, and translated in the Septuagint, Psalm 151 draws much of its content from I Sam, purporting to be spoken by David after his fight with Goliath. In the Codex Amiatinus it is introduced “psalmus dauid proprie extra numerum.” The psalm is also included in the *PSALTERIUM ROMANUM* (see *LITURGY*)—brought to Canterbury by St Augustine (Weber 1953 p ix), but the psalm does not occur in several English MSS of this psalter, including Pierpont Morgan 776 (HG 862), Cambridge University Library Ff.1.23 (HG 4), and East Berlin Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Hamilton 553 (HG 790). It does occur in the Additional MS (the Bosworth Psalter), but without an Old English gloss (Morrell 1965 p 129). The Vespasian Psalter, in its original plan, deliberately omitted this psalm, but it “was added by the 4th hand on an inserted leaf” (*EEMF* 14.46), and has been glossed. NRK (203) suggests that the Latin text is “probably by the same hand” as the Old English glosses, which he dates to the mid ninth century. Morrell (1965 pp 104, 111, 114, 118) records the presence of Psalm 151 in some Gallican Psalters (see *LITURGY*) with Old English glosses (above, nos 6, 9, 11, and 12), although in these cases the psalm is apparently not glossed. Mearns (1914 pp 94–95) notes simply that this psalm “is in many of the earlier Psalters,” and in addition to those already noted, he includes references to two more Gallican Psalters listed in HG (above, nos 7, and 10). James’ catalog (1911–12 vol 2) notes the psalm in the three Corpus MSS (the beginning is imperfect in 272); Schenkl (1969, V. Salisbury, p 44) in the second Salisbury MS (above 13); and Wilmart’s catalog (1937–45 vol 1) in the Vatican MS.

Citharismus Regis David contra Daemonium Saulis: *RBMA* 105.

See *PS PHILO*, *BIBLICAL ANTIQUITIES*.

Interdictio Salomonis [ANON.Inter.Sal.]: *RBMA* 108,15.

MSS—*Refs* none.

The *GELASIAN DECREE* (332) mentions as apocryphal an “Interdictio Salomonis,” also called in some manuscripts the “Contradictio Salomonis.” Because this work has not yet been identified, its relationship to other Solomon literature, particularly the Testament of Solomon—in which the Old Testament ruler interrogates various demons (*RBMA* 108,3, and *OTP* 1.935–87)—remains uncertain. The work has often been mentioned in connection with poetic *Solomon and Saturn* (*MSol*, A.13); for example, James (1920 p 52) states the Interdictio was the source for the Old English. Menner (GR 4337), following Vincenti (GR 4345), notes that “this sixth-century *Contradictio* could hardly . . . be the immediate and sole source of a poem which contrasted Germanic and Christian wisdom,” but he concludes that

it "is at least welcome testimony from an obscure period to the continued popularity of the apocryphal literature concerning Solomon, and if really a debate, might well be the ancestor of the medieval dialogues" (p 24).

Sibylline Oracles [ANON.Sibyl.]: *RBMA* 122; *OTP* 1.317–472; *NTA* 2.703–45.

MSS—*A-S Vers* none.

Quots/Cits ALDH.Metr. 79.24, 93.21, and 93.33: see below.

Refs *ÆL* 4 (B1.8.4) 712–25: see below.

Surviving primarily in Greek, the Sibylline Oracles span the pagan, Jewish, and Christian traditions, being written between the second century BC and the seventh century AD. According to Collins (*OTP* 1.318), "the most characteristic feature" of these works "is the prediction of woes and disasters to come upon mankind." The Latin tradition, as Bischoff (1966 pp 150–71) has shown, is dominated by the discussions of LACTANTIUS and particularly AUGUSTINE, who in *DE CIVITATE DEI* XVIII.23 includes a Latin translation of a Greek acrostic poem that begins *IHEOYΣ XPEICTOΣ ΘEOY YIOΣ ΣΩTHP*, and a collection of oracles drawn from Lactantius. However, Bischoff (1966 pp 164–68) has also edited a Latin text (*RBMA* 124.2.2), identified in one MS as the "prophetia Sibillae magnae," that he has discovered in three MSS, two of which date to the ninth century. Another Latin text (*RBMA* 124) is printed among the "dubia" of BEDE (*PL* 90.1181–86); Bischoff (1966 p 151) dates this work to the eleventh century.

ALDHelm quotes three lines from a Latin translation of the Greek acrostic poem mentioned above, identifying in each case the "Sibillinus versus" as his source. His citations, however, do not correspond with Augustine's translation. Bulst (1938) suggests that Aldhelm may have been the translator of this version; Lapidge (in Lapidge and Rosier 1985 p 265 note 8) considers this unlikely due to Aldhelm's limited knowledge of Greek, but indicates that the translation may have been produced in the school of THEODORE and HADRIAN (p 16).

In his discussion of the Old Testament canon, ÆLFRIC identifies the Sibyls as ten virgins who prophesied Christ to the heathens; he apparently follows traditions about the Sibyls represented in ISIDORE'S *ETYMOLOGIES* VIII.8.

Grau (GR 626, pp 51 and 67) cites Augustine's translation of the acrostic poem, and a passage in the Greek text as possible sources for *ChristC* (A3.1; 964–70a and 1195); neither however is conclusive (see Biggs 1986 pp 13 and 24).

The Greek text is edited by Geffcken (Bibliography Part I). Translations appear in the *OTP* 1.335–472; and the *NTA* 2.709–45 (on pp 741–45 is a

translation of Bischoff's "prophetia Sibillae magnae"). For further bibliography, see Charlesworth (1981 pp 184–88).

Ps Methodius, Revelationes [ANON.Rev./PS.METH.]: *GPG* 1830; *RBMA* 124.4–8.

MSS 1. Salisbury, Cathedral Library 165: HG 749.

2. ? London, BL Royal 5.F.xviii.

3. ? Oxford, St John's College 128.

4. ? Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 163 (*SC* 2016): HG 555.

Lists—*A-S Vers* none.

Quots/Cits see below.

Refs see below.

The original version of the *Revelationes* was a Syriac apocalypse with historical and prophetic sections. It recounts the Creation, Fall, and Flood followed by the succession of empires, the Arab invasions, the eventual triumph of the Last Roman Emperor, the coming of the Antichrist, and the end of the world. It was composed between 644–678, then translated into Greek in the seventh century, and into Latin in the eighth century (and thence into various vernaculars), directly influencing AD SO'S *LIBELLUS* (Verhelst 1973 pp 94–97), the *Visions of Daniel*, the medieval Alexander legend (Alexander 1985 p 14 etc., p 18 etc.), and the *Liber Aethici dilatus ex cosmographia* (*KVS* p 576).

Although the *Revelationes* is attested in 22 pre-twelfth-century Latin MSS and in four Latin recensions (Laureys and Verhelst 1988; Prinz 1985 pp 4–5), only Salisbury 165 (not listed in Laureys and Verhelst) is accepted as originating from England before 1100. The three other MSS are queried above because some uncertainty remains about their date and provenance. Royal 5.F.xviii is considered a Salisbury MS of the eleventh or twelfth century (Watson 1987 pp 60–61) or a Continental MS of the second half of the eleventh century (Prinz 1985 p 4 note 16). Bodley 163 is a composite MS, and the folios including the *Revelationes* are not listed in HG 555. Both parts of the MS are considered from the first quarter of the twelfth century by Madan (Madan, Craster, and Hunt 1895–1953 vol 2.1 p 164); Ker (1964 p 151) lists the MS as eleventh century without distinguishing the parts. D'Evelyn's (1918) text is from St John's College (she selects variants from Bodley 163), which has been dated either to the beginning of the eleventh century (Coxe 1852 vol 2 pp 38–39) or to the second half of the twelfth century (Prinz 1985 p 4 note 17).

BL Cotton Claudius B.iv (*Hexateuch*) contains Latin and late Old English notes to Genesis (B8.1.4.7) which cite "Methodius." NRK (142) dates the Old English notes to the mid-twelfth century. Crawford (GR 5236, pp

419–22 and GR 5244) transcribes only the Old English notes; see numbers 1, 6, 7, 12, 13, and possibly 18. The Latin notes citing “Methodius” may be found in *EEMF* 18, fols 3v, 8, 12v, and 28. The Kentish characteristics of the Old English notes are cited as partial evidence of Canterbury provenance (*EEMF* 18.16; NRK 142).

Hill (1987) notes that in preserving the tradition of a fourth son of Noah, the *Revelationes* may be relevant to the West-Saxon royal genealogies.

On the date of the text and translations into Greek and Latin, see Alexander (1985 pp 13–25); for texts of the four Greek recensions, see Lolos (1976); for the first Latin recension, see Sackur (1898 pp 59–96); and for the second Latin recension (found in the 4 MSS listed in A above), see Prinz (Bibliography Part I)—the same recension is in D’Evelyn (1918 pp 191–203).

Michael W. Twomey

II. APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS

The general term “Infancy Gospels” is used by modern scholars (e.g. Cullmann, in *NTA* 1.363–69) to refer to a number of overlapping texts that describe the birth of Mary, her marriage to Joseph, and the birth and childhood of Christ. Because the manuscript evidence is often incomplete, the relationships among these works remains at points unclear, but it seems preferable on the whole to consider them as discrete works; see below the *PROTEVANGELIUM OF JAMES*, the *DE NATIVITATE MARIAE*, and the *GOSPEL OF PS MATTHEW*. ÆLFRIC’s condemnation of this material is discussed under the *GOSPEL OF PS MATTHEW*, although the details he mentions could have been drawn from the other works.

Gospel of Bartholomew: see the *BOOK OF THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST* by Bartholomew; and the *QUESTIONS OF BARTHOLOMEW*.

Book of the Resurrection of Christ by Bartholomew [ANON.Res.Christ.Bart.]: see *RBMA* 135.

On the relationship between this work and the “Gospel of Bartholomew” see the *QUESTIONS OF BARTHOLOMEW*.

Heimann (1966 p 41) states that the six dragons springing from the head of Satan/Mors in the *Vita-Mors* drawing of the *Sphaera Apulei* in the *LEOFRIC MISSAL* (Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 579, fol 50, *IASIM* 95.4, cf. *IASIM* 203.17; see *LITURGY*) “are clearly the six sons of Death mentioned

in the apocryphal Coptic Book of the Resurrection of Christ,” and proposes the same source for another drawing in the Stuttgart Psalter (p 44). Dëshman (1977 p 167) accepts Heimann’s identification, but Jordan (1986 p 293; see also p 314 note 32) dismisses the suggestion with the comment that “there is no evidence that the work was ever known in the West during the Middle Ages,” referring instead to a cryptic allusion in ALDHELM’S *ÆNIGMATA* to Lucifer’s “six companions” (*comites*). It is not necessary to assume direct knowledge of the Book of the Resurrection of Christ, however, to believe that the motif is ultimately derived from Coptic apocryphal tradition. Coptic apocryphal motifs are known to have found their way into the West (see Dudley 1911), and the six (or seven) sons of Death or of Satan occur in other sources as well. The motif of the daughters of the Devil (anywhere from six to ten) is apparently a later medieval development; see P. Meyer (1900 pp 54–72).

Charles D. Wright

Questions of Bartholomew [ANON.Quaest.Bart.]: *RBMA* 135; *NTA* 1.484–508.

MSS—Quots/Cits none.

Refs BEDA.Comm.Luc., Prooemium: see below.

JEROME, in the Preface (*Plures fuisse*) to his *COMMENTARII IN MATHAEUM*, mentions Bartholomew in a list of authors supposed to have written gospels, and the GELASIAN DECREE also mentions an *Evangelia nomine Bartholomaei*. Jerome’s reference, however, may be from ORIGEN’S first homily on Luke, while the Gelasian Decree may in turn depend on Jerome. Two surviving works have been identified with the Gospel of Bartholomew, a Coptic *BOOK OF THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST* by Bartholomew and the *Questions of Bartholomew* extant in Greek, Slavonic, and Latin. The most recent investigation, by Kaestli (1988) urges that the latter work should be designated *Questions of Bartholomew* (as in the Slavonic and in one of the Latin manuscripts) rather than “Gospel of Bartholomew” (see pp 8–9), and suggests that the Gospel mentioned by Jerome and the Gelasian Decree may be a different work, perhaps attested in other scattered allusions and citations (p 9, note 14; see also Cherchi 1984). Kaestli concludes that the Coptic work has “only a few motifs in common” with the *Questions of Bartholomew*, “and they cannot be two recensions of the same original writing” (English Summary, p 6). Regarding the relationships of the various versions of the *Questions of Bartholomew*, Kaestli stresses that the conclusions of Wilmart and Tisserant must be reassessed in light of the evidence

of the complete Latin text published by Moricca. James (1924 pp 166–81) and the *NTA* include eclectic English translations of the Questions of Bartholomew, conflating the various versions; for criticisms see Kaestli (1988 pp 18–21).

Two MSS preserve Latin translations of the Questions of Bartholomew: Vatican, Reg. lat. 1050 (L), which contains three fragments of the text, edited by Wilmart and Tisserant (Bibliography Part I), and Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense 1880 (C), the only complete version, edited by Moricca (Bibliography Part I).

BEDE's reference to a gospel written by Bartholomew (*CCSL* 120.19) depends on Jerome.

Gollancz (GR 136, p civ) suggests that the devils' reference to a "son" of Satan in *Christ and Satan* (*Sat*, A1.4) may depend on the Questions of Bartholomew, in which Satan has a son named Salpsan. However, other more plausible explanations have been offered for the allusion (see Clubb, GR 3344, pp 62–63; Hill 1977c pp 323–35; and Finnegan 1977 p 27).

Grant (1982 pp 43 and 46) cites the "Gospel of Bartholomew" among other apocryphal texts for the archangel Michael's participation in creation and struggle with Satan in *LS* 24 (MichaelTristr, B3.3.24).

Henderson (1986 p 81, note 33) refers to the "Gospel of Bartholomew" (i.e. the Questions of Bartholomew, translated by James 1924 pp 174–75) as a possible source for Bartholomew's power over the devils in *Guthlac A* (*GuthA*, A3.2); but see Hill (1979 p 185, note 1) for another possible source in *PS ISIDORE, DE ORTU ET OBITU PATRUM* (the section on Bartholomew is dependent on *PS ABDIAS* according to Dumville 1973 p 314).

C. Wright (1987a pp 142–43) cites a passage from the Questions of Bartholomew (from Moricca's edition, p 512) as a possible source for a description of the creation of Adam (*De plasmatione Adam*, *CPL* 1155f viii; edited in *PLS* 4.937–41, and C. Wright 1987a pp 140–41; see also *ADAM OCTIPARTITE*) found in four early manuscripts, including an Anglo-Saxon missionary manuscript known as the *Vocabularius Sancti Galli* (St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 913, second half of the eighth century, "by a scribe trained in the Anglo-Saxon tradition," *CLA* 7.976; edited by Baesecke 1933). C. Wright (1987a pp 142–43) draws attention to a similar description of the creation of Adam in the probably Irish *Fragmentum Pragense* (*CPL* 2255; *KVS* An creat, edited in *PLS* 2.1484–85), where it is accompanied by allusions to the creation of the angels from fire and water and to the prior creation of Satanel, both motifs also found in the Questions of Bartholomew.

Charles D. Wright

Protevangelium of James [ANON.Proteuang.Iac.]: *RBMA* 141; *BHG* 1046; *NTA* 1.370–88.

MSS Cambridge, Pembroke College 25: HG 131.

Lists—Quots/Cits none.

Refs ? for Ælfric, see under GOSPEL OF PS MATTHEW.

This Greek apocryphon, compiled around 150–200 AD, contains the earliest written account of the Nativity and dedication of Mary, providing the names for her parents. It also recounts the miracles attending the births of John the Baptist and Christ, the flight of John and Elizabeth from Herod, and the murder of Zacharias. Extant Greek manuscripts number over 130, and translations exist in at least eight other Eastern languages. It must have been translated into Latin by the early sixth century when it was condemned in the GELASIAN DECREE (271). The first eight chapters of a Latin version, as noted by Clayton (1986a p 289) and Cross (1987a p 37 item 51), were known in England from their inclusion in a sermon on the Nativity of Mary in Pembroke 25 (see *HOMILIARY OF ST PÈRE DE CHARTRES* under *HOMILIARIES*).

Ties with Old English literature are not well established. Hill (GR 3481) proposed the Protevangelium as the source for a passage in the *Descent into Hell* (*Hell*, A3.26; 99–106) on the stasis of the Jordan River, but see Hall (forthcoming in *Traditio*) for an alternative view. Remly (1974) advanced the apocryphon as the source for a passage in *HomS* 40.3 (*VercHom* 10, B3.2.40.6) which contains an obscure allusion to Solomon by "sanctus Iacobus." Her thesis—that the passage confuses a statement in the canonical Iac with the mention in the Protevangelium not of Solomon but of Salome—is not convincing, and the allusion, certainly apocryphal, needs to be reexamined. At one time, influence of the Protevangelium or another "Infancy Gospel" was also suspected for the Joseph-Mary dialogue (lyric 7) in *ChristA* (A3.1); Cook (GR 3265) thus refers to supposed parallels from the Protevangelium, the GOSPEL OF PS MATTHEW, DE NATIVITATE MARIAE, and the *History of Joseph the Carpenter* (*RBMA* 156; at present there is no evidence of this work in Anglo-Saxon England) in the notes to his edition; for further bibliography, see Reinsch (1879 p 124). Any direct debt, however, has since been discounted (see Burlin, GR 3329; and Hill 1977b for a more likely source).

A new edition of the Greek text by A. Frey is forthcoming in the *CCSA*. At the moment, the best edition of the Greek is by de Strycker (1961); other editions include Tischendorf (1876 pp 1–50), Amann (Bibliography Part I), and de Santos Otero (1963 pp 136–76), which includes a Spanish translation, notes on the text, and a bibliography. An English translation appears in *NTA* 1.374–88, prefaced by a brief textual history pp 370–71. On

surviving early Latin versions, see Canal-Sánchez (1968) and Vattioni (1977). The Latin Nativity sermon in Pembroke 25 is unedited, but a variant is edited by Vattioni (1977) from a thirteenth-century MS. Other evidence for early circulation of a Latin version in the British Isles is offered by McNamara (1975), who draws attention to several distinctively Insular features of the Protevangelium in Montpellier, École de Médecine 55 (eighth or ninth century), concluding that Ireland in particular was "connected with the transmission, or even the formation of this Latin rendering of the Protevangelium" (p 39; see also pp 42-47 and 49).

Thomas N. Hall

Letters of Abgar and Jesus [ANON.Ep.Sal.]: *RBMA* 147; *NTA* 1.437-44; *DACL* 1.87-97.

MSS London, BL Royal 2.A.xx: HG 450.

Lists none.

A-S Vers *ÆLS* (Abdon & Sennes, Bl.3.24) 81-188.

Quots/Cits — *Refs* none.

Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* I.13 — known through RUFINUS' translation — is the first witness to this apocryphal correspondence between Abgar, ruler of Edessa, and Christ. Other Church Fathers noted that Christ left behind no collection of writings (e.g. AUGUSTINE, *DE CONSENSU* 11.16-18), which may have led to the letters being condemned in the GELASIAN DECREE (328-29).

The Royal MS, which contains only Christ's letter but with additions not found in the *Ecclesiastical History*, is closely related to Irish prayer books; see *SEHI* 576). Loomis (GR 5358) notes that ÆLFRIC's source is Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*.

The Royal MS has been printed in the appendix to Kuypers (1902 pp 205-06). An English translation of the relevant part of Eusebius' work is in the *NTA* 1.441-44.

Sunday Letter [ANON.Epist.Sal.Dom.]: *RBMA* 148,3; *DACL* 3.1534-46 and 4.858-994.

MSS — *Lists* none.

A-S Vers 1. *HomU* 35.1 (Nap 43, B3.4.35.1).

2. *HomU* 35.2 (Nap 44, B3.4.35.2).

3. *HomU* 36 (Nap 45, B3.4.36).

4. *HomU* 46 (Nap 57, B3.4.46).

5. *HomU* 53 (NapSunEpis, B3.4.53).

6. *HomU* 54 (Pribsch, B3.4.54).

7. *HomM* 6 (KerOthoB 10, B3.5.6).

Quots/Cits BONIF.Epist. 59, 115.13-28: see below.

Refs ECGRED.Epist. 21-22.

The Sunday Letter (also known as the "Heavenly Letter" and the Carta Dominica), apparently composed in Greek in the sixth century (*RBMA* 148), became widely disseminated in the West; see Delehaye (1899). The letter purports to be from Christ, and to be written variously in his own blood, with a golden rod, or dictated to an angel, and to have fallen on one of the principal altars of Christendom — often Rome, Jerusalem, or Bethlehem. The work survives in a number of Latin MSS (that have been only generally divided into recensions), but has yet to be identified in MSS known in England during the Anglo-Saxon period.

The Old English versions, however, can be divided into three groups that are related to different recensions of the known Latin tradition. *HomU* 36 and *HomU* 54 are generally agreed to represent the first Latin recension, which survives in Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek lat. 1355 (edited by Pribsch, Bibliography Part I), and Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 12270 (edited by Delehaye, Bibliography Part I); see Pribsch (Bibliography Part I), Whitelock (1982 p 54) and Lees (1985a p 132). The Paris MS is recognized as particularly close to *HomU* 54; see Pribsch (1936 p 10), Whitelock (1982 p 62 note 95), and Lees (1985a pp 133-34). Apparently *HomM* 6, destroyed in the 1731 fire, belonged to this group; see Whitelock (1982 p 54 note 51). The second group includes *HomU* 46 and *HomU* 53; Whitelock (1982 p 55) states that these are "independent translations of a text with similarities with [Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek] Clm 9550," (edited by Delehaye, Bibliography Part I). The third group includes *HomU* 35.1 and 35.2. Whitelock (1982 p 51) has discussed these homilies in detail, arguing that they "are variant versions of a lost homily," that in turn was based on "Pehtred's book" mentioned in Ecgred's letter to Wulf-sige (see *Refs* above). This letter makes it clear that the book contained a version of the Sunday Letter. Whitelock (1982 pp 52-58) also compares these two Old English homilies with the Irish *Cáin Domnaig* (on the Irish tradition, see McNamara 1975 pp 60-63), and both the Old English and Old Irish texts with Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 9550 (pp 58-59).

Pribsch (1936 pp 4-5) notes that BONIFACE quotes from the beginning of a version of the Letter similar to that printed from the transcription of a now lost MS in the Cathedral Library of Tarragona by Petrus de Marca, archbishop of Paris (d. 1164); the transcription is edited by Pribsch (Bibliography Part I).

Related to the Sunday Letter is a tradition of Sunday Lists, also known as the "Benedictions of Sunday" or the *Dignatio diei dominici* (DACL 4.985–86; see also HIBERNO-LATIN BIBLICAL COMMENTARIES, NUMBER *4). Tveitane (GR 6242, p 127) suggests that these lists "developed from a shorter form, agreeing with biblical tradition, towards a much longer, apocryphal version . . ."; see also Lees (1985 pp 136–43). These longer versions appear in three recensions edited by McNally (Bibliography Part I), and include Vatican, Pal. lat. 220—a ninth-century MS in an Anglo-Saxon hand. Whitelock (1982 p 59) cites McNally's list III as a parallel to *HomU* 35.1. A list also appears in item 33 of Cambridge, Pembroke College MS 25 (see the HOMILIARY OF ST PÈRE DE CHARTRES; Lees 1986 p 142, and Cross 1987a p 32).

Although there are three fifteenth-century Latin MSS in the BL that combine the two works (see Lees 1985a pp 135–36), none have been identified from our period. Whitelock (1982 p 60) argues that they were combined in the Latin text used by Pehtred and by the author of *Cáin Domnaig*. The Old English homilies that contain both a Sunday Letter and a Sunday List are *HomU* 35.1; *HomU* 35.2; *HomU* 36; *HomU* 46; and *HomU* 53. Sunday Lists also occur in *HomS* 27 (B3.2.27; edited by Lees 1986, lines 31–70) and in an early Middle English homily, "In die dominica," preserved in London, Lambeth Palace 487 (edited by Morris, GR 6214, number 14; see Lees 1985a pp 143–46).

In addition to the Latin texts already mentioned, see also editions by Priebisch (1901 pp 400–06; BL Royal 8.F.vi), Röhrich (1890 pp 440–42; Hamburg, Bibliothek der Hansestadt, S. Petri Kirche 30b), and Rivière (1906 pp 602–05; Toulouse, Bibliothèque Publique 208). For the Old English homilies, see also Jost (GR 6528, pp 221–36). A recent overview of the subject can be found in Deletant (1977).

Clare A. Lees

Historia de ligno crucis: RBMA 151.

[Thomas N. Hall]

De Nativitate Mariae [ANON.Nat.Mariae]: RBMA 160.

- MSS 1. Durham, Cathedral Library A.III.29: HG 222.
2. Salisbury, Cathedral Library 179: HG 753.
3. ? Worcester, Cathedral Library F.94.

Lists—Quots/Cits none.

Refs ? for Ælfric, see under the GOSPEL OF PS MATTHEW.

De Nativitate Mariae, a revision of the GOSPEL OF PS MATTHEW, dates from the Carolingian period or, more probably, later. It has frequently been attributed to PASCHASIUS RADBERTUS, but Beyers (1980), the most recent editor, has shown that this attribution is improbable. The first proof of the existence of the apocryphon is in a sermon by FULBERT OF CHARTRES (SERMO DE NATIVITATE 6–29). In private communication, J.E. Cross has noted the presence of this work in the Worcester MS, which, although not listed in HG, is a companion to Worcester F.91 (HG 762) and F.92 (HG 763).

De Nativitate Mariae was clearly known in Winchester in the eleventh century. The Durham manuscript, a version of the homiliary of PAUL THE DEACON, has Winchester connections, as it contains texts for the two feasts of St Swithun and for the feasts of St Birinus and St Æthelthryth. The author of the benediction for the feast of the Conception of the Virgin in the Canterbury Benedictional (London, BL Harley 2892: HG 429) seems to have known the text also. The benediction (Woolley 1917 pp 118–19) refers to the angel's announcement of Mary's name before her birth, a detail that seems to depend on the De Nativitate Mariae, the only apocryphon to include it. Prescott (1987) argues that the Canterbury benedictional was probably composed in Winchester.

Amann (Bibliography Part I) has been superseded by the superior but less accessible Beyers (1980), which includes as well a discussion of the history of the text. An earlier edition is by Tischendorf (1876 pp 113–21). For further discussion, see Clayton (forthcoming).

Mary Clayton

De Transitu Mariae [ANON.Trans.Mariae]: RBMA 164.

MSS Cambridge, Pembroke College 25: HG 131.

Lists none.

A-S Vers 1. LS 20 (AssumptMor, B3.3.20): see below.

2. LS 21 (AssumptTristr, B3.3.21).

Quots/Cits BEDA.Retract.Act. VIII.1.5–35: see below.

Refs 1. BEDA.Retract.Act. XIII.2.7–19.

2. ? ÆCHom I, 30 (B1.1.32) 436.6–20: see below.

3. ? ÆCHom II, 34 (B1.2.36) 115–33: see below.

Apocryphal texts discussing the death and assumption of the Virgin appear, at the latest, by the fifth century. Because of complex textual histories in several different languages, the versions have yet to be fully sorted out into separate traditions, but the Latin versions relevant to Anglo-Saxonists (Transitus B2 [RBMA 164.5.1] and Transitus C [RBMA 164.6.1])

apparently both descend from a lost Greek version of the fifth century via a Latin text of the fifth to seventh century (see Clayton 1986b pp 25–26). *Transitus B2*, which purports to be the work of Melito (thus the attribution to *PS MELITO*), dates to the fifth century according to Haibach-Reinisch (Bibliography Part I) and is older than the version (*B1*) published by Tischendorf (1866 pp 124–36). *Transitus C*, composed according to Wenger (1955 p 66) in the seventh or eighth century, has been edited by Wilmart (Bibliography Part I), but *Pembroke 25* (see the *HOMILIARY OF ST PÈRE DE CHARTRES*) was not collated for this edition. The work is condemned in the *GELASIAN DECREE* (296).

LS 20 (*AssumptMor*) combines *Transitus C* (pp 137–55.19) and *Transitus B2* (pp 155.19–57.35); see Willard (GR 6184 and 6185) and Clayton (1986b). The homilist, however, apparently used an abridged version of *Transitus C*, from which references to the corporal assumption of the Virgin had been eliminated (Clayton 1986b). (The version of *C* in *Pembroke 25* is less close to the Old English than is the one in *St Gall*, *Stiftsbibliothek 732* [Wilmart's *G*], although even this MS does not correspond to the Old English in all respects.) The homilist then draws on *B2* for a detailed account of the assumption. The two accounts may of course have been combined in a source not yet discovered. *LS 21* (*AssumptTristr*), also from *B2* (see Clayton 1989), is a more faithful and competent translation of this version than is *LS 20*.

B2 was known to *BEDE*, who quotes directly from it and objects to its chronology in his *RETRACTIO* (the *CCSL* provides references to *PG* 5.1233 and 1234, and to Tischendorf 1866 pp 125ff). Haibach-Reinisch suggests that *B2* was disseminated in southern Germany by Anglo-Saxon missionaries. This version is probably the basis for the account of the Virgin's assumption given by the Anglo-Saxon nun Huneberc (*Vita Willibaldi*, *MGH Scriptores* 15, part 1, 93.16), who wrote in Heidenheim Germany around 780, although it contains details which do not agree with any published apocryphon; her account may be based on hearsay.

In his Assumption homilies in both *CATHOLIC HOMILIES I* and *II*, *ÆLFRIC* objects to the circulation of unauthorized apocryphal accounts: he was presumably referring to *B2* or to *C*, or to both.

The influence of the *Transitus* texts can also be discerned in Anglo-Saxon art. A carved stone slab in Wirksworth, Derbyshire (published J. Campbell 1982 illustration 136), which Cramp (1977) dates to the first half of the ninth century, includes a representation of the dead Mary on a bier carried by two apostles (Peter and Paul, according to the apocryphal tradition), preceded by another figure carrying a palm (John). Attached by his hands to the bier is the Jew who wished to burn Mary's body and in a circle or cloud above are six heads, presumably angels. The *Benedictional*

of *St Æthelwold* (London, BL Add. 49598, fol 102v; *IASIM* 111.25), a Winchester manuscript of 971–84, includes a miniature of the feast of Mary's Assumption which depicts nine apostles, while above them Mary lies on a bed, attended by three women, and the hand of God, flanked by four angels, lowers a crown. The scene clearly illustrates the death of Mary as recounted in the apocryphal narratives. Deshman (1970 pp 86–87) and Therel (1984 pp 53–54) argue that the artist was illustrating a scene found only in *Transitus A* (Wenger 1955 pp 245–56), but there is no evidence that this particular apocryphon was known outside of Reichenau; moreover, the scene can be paralleled in *Transitus C* (see Clayton, forthcoming). A simplified version of this miniature is found in the *Benedictional* of Robert of Jumièges (Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale 369, fol 54v: HG 923).

LS 21 has been edited more recently by Grant (1982). For the knowledge of the *Transitu Mariae* in Ireland, see McNamara (1975 pp 122–23), and Willard (1937 pp 341–64). For further discussion of *Transitus C*, see Willard 1939.

Mary Clayton

Gospel of Ps Matthew [ANON.Euang.Ps.Matt.]: *RBMA* 168; *BHL* 5334–42; *NTA* 1.406.

MSS London, BL Cotton Nero E.i: HG 344.

Lists none.

A-S Vers *LS* 18 (B3.3.18).

Quots/Cits 1. *HomU* 10 (*VercHom* 6, B3.4.10): see below.

2. ? *ANON.OEMart* (B19.gx): see below.

Refs 1. ? *ÆCHom* II, 36.2 (B1.2.39): see below.

2. ? *ÆHomM* 8 (Ass 3, B1.5.8) 5–7a: see below.

The Gospel of Ps Matthew is a composite Latin apocryphon whose date is difficult to determine; *NTA* 1.406 advises “probably about the eighth or ninth century.” Scholars once speculated that PASCHASIUS RADBERTUS compiled the tract in the first half of the ninth century (see Canal-Sánchez 1968 p 473; accepted by *RBMA* vol 8), but the most recent assessment has pushed the date back to 550–700, rendering the text once more anonymous (Gijssels 1981 p 12). J.E. Cross in correspondence notes that chapters 1–6 “with slight variations and omissions” occur in the British Library MS Cotton Nero E.i, Pt. II, fols 116v–18. He continues “thus a section of Ps Matthew is used as an item called ‘sermo’ in a legendary”; (see further the *COTTON-CORPUS LEGENDARY* (see *LEGENDARIES*); and Cross 1985b pp 125–26 who shows that this tract also appears in ninth-century Continental MSS). It

is as yet unpublished, and its relationship to other versions of the apocryphon has not been determined.

The text, as printed in Tischendorf (Bibliography Part I), falls into three parts: chapters 1–17 comprise a selective translation of the *PROTEVANGELIUM OF JAMES*, detailing the early life of Mary but omitting, for instance, any mention of John the Baptist; chapters 18–24 recount the Flight into Egypt; and chapters 25–42, probably based on the Gospel of Thomas (*RBMA* 175,2–23; there is no independent evidence for the knowledge of this work in Anglo-Saxon England), narrate the eccentric childhood miracles of Christ.

One partial translation exists in Old English in an anonymous sermon on the Nativity of Mary (*LS* 18, B3.3.18) found in three MSS: Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 343 (B3.3.18.2); Oxford, Bodleian Library Hatton 114 (B3.3.18.3); and imperfectly in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 367 (B3.3.18.1). Assmann's edition (*BaP* 3.117–37) is based on the Bodley and Hatton MSS. The text translates chapters 1–12 of Ps Matthew beginning with the infertile marriage of Anna and Joachim and continuing through the doubting of Mary.

A series of translated excerpts is also incorporated into *HomU* 10 (*VercHom* 6, B3.4.10). In the notes to his edition, Förster (GR 6200) shows lines 61–90 of the homily to correspond closely to chapters 13, 17–18 and 22–25 of Ps Matthew. The detail from chapter 25, however, depends ultimately on Mt 2.19–20, and so provides little evidence of when the sections from the Gospel of Thomas were incorporated into Ps Matthew. The details from Ps Matthew in the Old English *Martyrology* could have derived from the version in the British Library (MSS above); see Cross (1985a p 248) and for further discussion of this passage, see Herzfeld (GR 6364, p 235) and Kotzor (1981 pp 348–49).

Following the homily for the sixteenth Sunday after Pentecost in the *CATHOLIC HOMILIES II*, ÆLFRIC includes a brief note on the birth of the Virgin in which he condemns apocryphal traditions (*ÆCHom* II, 36.2), while in fact recording some material from them. Similarly, in his homily for the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary (*ÆHomM* 8), he again states that he will avoid apocrypha.

Elsewhere, two episodes from Ps Matthew (from chapters 23 and 24) are paralleled in a sermon on the Nativity of the Innocents in Pembroke 25 (see Cross 1987a p 23, item 11; Cross 1987b p 64; and the *HOMILIARY OF ST PÈRE DE CHARTRES*). A Latin gloss to Ps 148.10 in the Vatican, Pal. lat. 68 (HG 909) quotes from Ps Matthew 18.1 (McNamara 1986 p 308). Also relevant is Saxl's argument (GR 4267, pp 4–5) for at least indirect influence of an Infancy Gospel, probably Ps Matthew, on the Flight into Egypt (or out of Egypt) panel on the Ruthwell Cross—a belief affirmed by Swanton (GR 3487, pp 15–16).

Clayton (forthcoming) discusses the two illustrations of Ps Matthew in Cotton Caligula A.xiv, the earliest surviving in a Western MS (see *IASIM* 202.7 and 8).

A new edition of Ps Matthew is in preparation for *CCSA* by J. Gijssels and R. Beyers. In addition to Tischendorf (Bibliography Part I), Amann (1910 pp 272–338) prints chapters 1–17, with a French translation; see also the edition of de Santos Otero (1963 pp 179–242), with a translation. On the textual history, see Gijssels (1971–80), Gijssels (1976), and Gijssels (1981). For early Irish knowledge of this work see McNamara (1975 p 48); note too that the Gospel of Thomas circulated in Ireland. For further discussion of the Old English evidence, see Healey (1985 pp 102–03).

Thomas N. Hall

Gospel of Thomas: *RBMA* 175: see the *GOSPEL OF PS MATTHEW*.

Gospel of Nicodemus [ANON.Euang.Nic.]: *RBMA* 179,4–27; *NTA* 1.444–84; *DB* 3.544–47.

MSS London, BL Royal 5.E.xiii: HG 459.

Lists Exeter: ML 10.14.

A-S Vers 1. *NicA* (B8.5.2.1).

2. *NicB* (B8.5.2.2).

3. *NicC* (B8.5.3.1).

Quots/Cits—Refs none.

The title Gospel of Nicodemus, used in the later Middle Ages (e.g. Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale* Book 7, chapters 40, 41, 48, 56 etc.), has been variously applied to the four recensions of the work distinguished in the scholarship. Since translations of Greek recension A exist in several oriental languages, scholars generally agree that it is the original version, but disagree on when it was composed; the prologue dates the work to 425 and EPIPHANIUS refers to what might have been something like it in the late fourth century (*NTA* 1.447). This version, known as the “Commentaries” of Nicodemus (a supposed disciple mentioned in Io 3.1–10, 7.50, and 19.39), retells the trial, passion, resurrection and ascension of Christ. The later recensions, one in Greek and two in Latin, add to the narrative the “Descensus Christi ad Inferos” (the Harrowing of Hell), the ostensible account by Karinus and Leucius, two “eyewitnesses” who rose at the Crucifixion (Mt 27.52–53). Of main interest to Anglo-Saxonists is Latin recension A, which contains material from both the “Commentaries” and the “Descensus” and appends a letter from Pilate to the emperor Claudius. A early witness of Latin recension A, which contains only the “Commen-

taries," is a fifth-century MS (*CLA* 10.1485); O'Ceallaigh's (1963) error in dating this MS to the ninth century (see Philippiart 1970 p 396) undermines many of his dates. A later MS of Latin recension A, which contains all three parts, is Einsiedeln Stiftsbibliothek, MS 326 (*RBMA* 179.27; edited by Kim, Bibliography Part I); this recension apparently underlies the Old English versions.

Editors refer to the "Commentaries" as part 1 (prologue and chapters 1–16) and to the "Descensus" as part 2 (chapters 17–27 and the letter). The titles "Acta Pilati" and "Gesta Pilati" are sometimes applied to part 1 and sometimes to the whole work. The *descensus* theme dates to the early patristic period, and part 2 may be earlier than part 1 (*NTA* 1.449), but O'Ceallaigh (1963 p 23) believes that the Gospel of Nicodemus' *descensus* narrative was originally a Latin production (see also Collett 1981 p 30).

The Royal MS (*RBMA* 179.12), "written in several hands of continental type, but with corrections in an English hand of the tenth century" (Warner and Gilson 1921 vol 1 p 116), belongs to Latin recension A. It omits the prologue and the MS ends as a palimpsest shortly before the end of chapter 27. Ker (1964 p 208) lists it as a Worcester manuscript. J.J. Campbell (1982 p 112 note 9) doubts it was the source of the Old English translations.

Each of the three Old English versions "seems to descend independently from the translator's autograph" (J.J. Campbell 1982 p 114), though the possibilities of intermediate versions and of subsequent collations with the Latin complicate matters. *NicA* (Cambridge, Univ. Lib II.2.11), in which the Gospel of Nicodemus appears after the four Gospels, is the earliest manuscript. It represents a literal translation except where it omits and "splices" sections together (Allen 1968 p 11). Allen identifies two major omissions from part 1: chapters 5–11 (debate of the Jewish leaders with Nicodemus, scourging, and crucifixion), and chapters 16–17 (reports of Christ's post-resurrection activity). Part 2 omits chapters 27–29 (dialogue between Pilate and Annas and Caiphas). *NicB* (London, BL Cotton Vitellius A.15) lacks at the beginning approximately two printed pages of *NicA*. Although *NicB* contains some details from the Latin not found in *NicA* (and so *NicA* cannot be its sole direct source), it also omits the three major sections omitted by *NicA*, and is otherwise so close verbally to *NicA* that Hulme (GR 5741, p 583) and Förster (GR 5740, p 319) suggest a common original. Allen (1968 p 53) postulates the existence of a version based on *NicA* that *NicB* used while consulting the Latin. *NicC* (London, BL Cotton Vespasian D.xiv) "extends the splicing and abridging technique" (Allen 1968 p 49) of *NicA* and *B* in homiletic form. Again, minor additions lead Allen to postulate collation with the Latin, though he admits that it is not "an absolute necessity" (p 53).

In addition to the direct use of Latin recension A, scholars have often cited the Gospel of Nicodemus when discussing examples of the Harrowing; see GR 3344 p 98; GR 3479 pp 349–52; and Allen and Calder (1976 pp 175–76). The motif is popular in Old English poetry and prose from at least as early as the time of BEDE (see, for example, his *IN ASCENSIONE DOMINI*). The issue, however, is complicated both by the evolution of orthodox Church doctrine and by popular developments of the theme. Independent of the Gospel of Nicodemus proper, but of particular interest to Anglo-Saxonists, is the PSEUDO AUGUSTINE, HOMILY 160 (*PL* 39.2059–61) on the Harrowing proposed by Förster (GR 5353) as a source for *HomS* 26 (*BlHom* 7; B3.2.26). Building on this argument, Dumville (1972 p 375) postulates a lost Latin homily that drew on homily 160 as a source for the discussion of the Harrowing in the ninth-century section of the *BOOK OF CERNE* (see *LITURGY*) and *HomS* 26 (*BlHom* 7). This tradition may also underlie the entry on the Harrowing in the Old English *Martyrology* for March 26 (B19.bn); and it may also be related to an anonymous homily in Oxford, Bodleian Library Junius 121 (*HomS* 28, B3.2.28; printed by Luiselli Fadda 1972); but J.J. Campbell thinks not (1982 p 140). Similarly, the Harrowing composes the first part of an anonymous homily for Easter preserved in two Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MSS, 41 and 303 (*NicD* and *E* [B8.5.3.2; a better title would be *HomS* 29 B3.2.29.1 and 2]). The immediate source has not yet been found, although the phrase "an þissum bokum" implies that the homilist worked from written sources, and the connection of 41 to the Leofric donation (NRK 32) may indicate some link to *NicA* (ML 10.14). Moreover, a discussion of the Harrowing appears in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 162 (*HomS* 27, B3.2.27; see Lees 1986). Descent loci in Old English poetry include the *Descent into Hell* (*Hell*, A3.26); *ChristA*, *B* and *C* (A3.1); *Christ and Satan* (*Sat*, A1.4), and *GuthB* (A3.2).

J.J. Campbell's study (1982) is the most comprehensive for the Old English material although his thesis—that little convincing evidence has been advanced for the knowledge of the Gospel before the translations (*NicA*, *B*, and *C*)—as a negative one leaves the question open. Healey (1985) is more willing to see the direct influence of the Gospel in a variety of texts; see also the bibliographical essay by Pelteret in Woods and Pelteret (1985 pp 164–65). Hulme (GR 5736) prints *NicA* and *NicB*; Allen 1968 prints *NicA* and variants from *NicB* and *C*, as well as a Latin text based on Tischendorf (1876). *NicA* also appears in Crawford (GR 5737) and *NicC* in Warner (GR 5292). In addition to the text edited by Kim (Bibliography Part I), see Tischendorf (1876) and more recently Collett (1981), who edits an example of recension A in Oxford, Bodleian Library Fairfax 17 (twelfth century) and of recension B in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 288 (thirteenth

century). The exact relationship of the four recensions awaits critical editions of the texts now in progress for the CCSA.

James H. Morey

Vindicta Salvatoris: *RBMA* 180.

[Thomas N. Hall]

III. APOCRYPHAL ACTS

From the New Testament, the Anglo-Saxons would have known of the Apostles as the twelve disciples chosen by Christ to spread his message (Mt 10.1–42, Mc 3.13–19, Lc 6.12–16, and Act 1.13–26; for a discussion of the term “apostle” prior to the writing of the Gospels, see *NTA* 2.25–31; and for remarks on discrepancies in the canonical lists, see the *NCE* under “apostle”). In addition to the canonical traditions, apocryphal material also circulated in the early Church, with five early Acts (John, Peter, Paul, Andrew, and Thomas) competing with the canonical Acts of the Apostles. According to Schneemelcher and de Santos (*NTA* 2.571), the “literary ‘type’ of the apocryphal Acts lingered on and proved effective beyond the third century and then gradually merged with that of sacred legend” (see *ACTA SANCTORUM*). The Anglo-Saxons would have derived much of their knowledge of the apocryphal traditions from these later texts, referred to as “Passions,” which are dated generally between the third and sixth centuries. BEDE (*RETRACTIO IN ACTUS APOSTOLORUM* I.13) refers to “historiae” containing “passiones apostolorum,” which he asserts are held by most to be apocryphal. The detail he cites is referred in the *CCSL* to PS ABDIAS, APOSTOLICAE HISTORIAE, but Bede need not be referring specifically to this work. Similarly the mention of “passiones apostolorum” in the Exeter List (ML 10.42) could refer to the Ps Abdias collection, to the anonymous *BREVIARIUM APOSTOLORUM*; or to collections such as Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, M.p.th.f.78 (*CLA* 9.1425; Anglo-Saxon majuscule and minuscule, written according to Lowe, “in an Anglo-Saxon center on the Continent, perhaps in the Würzburg region”) and Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale II 1069 (*CLA* 10.1551; also “written in an Anglo-Saxon center on the Continent”). Apocryphal traditions about the Apostles circulated as well in other works; see in particular the two collections called *DE ORTU ET OBITU PATRUM*, by ISIDORE and PS ISIDORE.

Following the *RBMA*, this section begins with works that include most of the apostles, and then considers works dealing with one, or sometimes

two, apostles, arranged by apostle in alphabetical order. As in the *RBMA*, PS CLEMENS and the apocryphal EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE LAODICEANS are included in this section. For an overview of research on the Apocryphal Acts, see Bovon and van Esbroeck (1981), MacDonald (1986), and the *DS* under “apocryphes.”

Breviarium apostolorum [ANON.Breu.apos.]: *RBMA* 191.1; *BHL* 652.

MSS none.

Lists ? see APOCRYPHAL ACTS (above).

A-S Vers—Refs none.

The *Breviarium* lists thirteen apostles (including both Paul and Matthias, but excluding Judas Iscariot) and provides in most cases an etymology for the name, a brief biography, and the feastday of each. The first manuscript witness of the work is in the two supplementary quires of the Gelasian Sacramentary (Vatican, Reg. lat. 316) preserved in Paris (Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 7193; see Lowe 1925–26 pp 357–73), a MS that dates to the eighth century. As noted by de Gaiffer (1963), the work also appears in Vatican, Pal. lat. 235, but beyond the folios accepted by HG 910.

The possibility that the *Breviarium* is a source for Cynewulf’s *Fates of the Apostles* (*Fates*, A2.2) has been discussed since Sarrazin (GR 3653; see also 3656, 1446, 1419, 6357A, and 1420), but the problem has remained unresolved because there is much overlap among the possible sources, and no single source has been identified for the entire poem; see, in particular, Cross (1979a passim). Lapidge (in Lapidge and Rosier 1985 p 42) asserts that section 4 of ALDHELM’S *CARMINA ECCLESIASTICA* (“On the Altars of the Twelve Apostles”) belongs to a tradition that includes this work.

In addition to Mohlberg (Bibliography Part I), the work is printed in Schermann (1907 pp 207–11), who notes readings from six MSS. It is translated in Allen and Calder (1976 pp 37–39).

Notitia de locis Apostolorum [ANON.Notit.Apost.]: *BHL* 648; not in *RBMA*.

MSS—Refs none.

Printed in the introductory material to the *MARTYROLOGIUM HIERONYMIANUM* (see *MARTYROLOGIES*) in the *PL* (30.435–37), the *Notitia* lists the feasts of twelve apostles, in most cases a place with which they are associated, and in some cases, additional biographical details.

Brooks (GR 1420, p xxx) comments that the order of Apostles in the *Fates* (A2.2) is closest to that found in this work; see also Cross (1979a).

In addition to the edition in Schermann (Bibliography Part I), the text

appears in the *AS* (Nov, vol 2 pars posterior, p 2), from which Allen and Calder (1976 p 37) translate.

Nomina locorum in quo apostoli requiescunt [ANON.Nom.Apost.]: *BHL* 651d; not in *RBMA*.

MSS Durham, Cathedral Library A.IV.19: HG 223.

Lists—Refs none.

As the title indicates, this text lists the resting places of the apostles, including John the Baptist and St Stephen. It occurs in the *DURHAM RITUAL* (see *LITURGY*; GR 6129, pp 195–97) with an interlinear gloss in Old English (*DurRitGlCom*, C13.1).

Ps Abdias, Historiae Apostolicae [ANON.Hist.Apos./PS.ABD.]: *RBMA* 192.

MSS none.

Lists ? see APOCRYPHAL ACTS (above).

A-S Vers none.

Quots/Cits see below.

Refs ? see APOCRYPHAL ACTS (above).

Compiled in Gaul in the sixth century (Kaestli 1981 p 52), the *Historiae* contains the following sections: 1 Peter; 2 Paul; 3 Andrew; 4 James the Great; 5 John; 6 Simon, Jude, and James the Less; 7 Matthew; 8 Bartholomew; 9 Thomas; and 10 Philip. Some are drawn from Acts (or Passions) that still exist, and so, as Cross (1979b p 17) points out, it is often impossible to determine if this collection has been used. Nor is it certain if the entire collection was known in Anglo-Saxon England (see the headnote above for possible general references), although the possibility that ÆLFRIC consulted it for his *CATHOLIC HOMILIES* was suggested by Förster (GR 5300, pp 43–45; see also Zettel 1979 p 4).

If a *passio* that has been discussed as a possible source for an Anglo-Saxon text exists independently of the *Historiae*, it is discussed later in this section (with a cross-reference at this point). Some relevant versions, however, are unique to the *Historiae*.

Andrew (see *BHL* 430): Herzfeld (GR 6364, p xlii) identifies the account of Andrew's passion (502–15) as the source for the Old English *Martyrology* entry on Andrew (B19.hf). Cross (1979b pp 27–28), who notes that this entry in the *Martyrology* also draws on the *PASSIO ANDREAE*, adds specific details drawn from Ps Abdias that do not occur in the *Passio*. Cross (1979a pp 170–71) also considers Ps Abdias a possible source for details about

Andrew in the *Fates* (A2.2; 16–22), but none of these details are restricted to this source. See also *ACTA ANDREAE ET MATTHIAE*.

Bartholomew: see *PASSIO BARTOLOMAEI* and the *QUESTIONS OF BARTHOLOMEW*.

James the Great: Herzfeld (GR 6364 p xl) cites this account in relation to the Old English *Martyrology* entry (B19.ex), but Cross (1979b pp 32–34; following Cockayne, GR 296) notes that the Bible is the primary source. Cross (1979a p 172) mentions this work as a possible source for details about James in Cynewulf's *Fates of the Apostles* (*Fates*, A2.2; 33b–37a), but here, too, most are biblical. See also the *PASSIO JACOBI MAIORIS*.

James the Less (*BHL* 4089): Cross (1979b pp 29–31) notes that this account relies on EUSEBIUS-RUFINUS *HISTORIA ECCLESIASTICA*, and so is a possible source for the Old English *Martyrology* entry (B19.ds); similarly Cross (1979a p 174) considers this account a possible source for material on James in Cynewulf's *Fates* (A2.2; 70–74). See also the *PASSIO JACOBI MAIORIS*.

John (*BHL* 4316): item 10 of Cambridge, Pembroke College MS 25 (see the *HOMILIARY OF ST PÈRE DE CHARTRES*, and Cross 1987a p 22) is largely drawn from the account of John's death in the *Historiae* (581.3–589.14). Herzfeld (GR 6364 p xxxvi) cites this work as the source for the entry in the Old English *Martyrology* (B19.e), but Cross (1979b pp 34–37) qualifies this suggestion. See also *PS MELLITUS*, *PASSIO JOHANNIS*.

Matthew: see the *PASSIO MATTHAEI*.

Paul: see the *PASSIO PAULI*.

Peter: see the *PASSIO PETRI*.

Philip: see the *PASSIO PHILIPPI*.

Simon and Jude: see the *PASSIO SIMONIS ET JUDAE*.

Thomas (*BHL* 8140): apparently not used in Anglo-Saxon England, but see the *PASSIO THOMAE*.

According to Kaestli (1981 p 52), Fabricius (*Bibliography Part I*) reprints the edition of Lazius (1551); however, the edition of Nausea (1531) is closer to the manuscripts.

Acta Andreac: *RBMA* 198.

Ogilvy (*BKE* p 68) incorrectly states that Förster (GR 6173, pp 202–06) identified this work as the source of Blickling 19 (*LS* 1.1): Förster in fact showed that *ACTA ANDREAE ET MATTHIAE* is the source of this homily. The case of Worcester Cathedral Library F.91 is less easily resolved: Floyer (1906 p 46), the catalog from which Ogilvy apparently worked, comments on this MS: "Bound up at the end of the volume are three folios of a treatise (Acts of St. Andrew?) eleventh century, or earlier." This MS is in HG 762.

Acta Andreae et Matthiae [ANON.Act.Andr.Matt.]: *RBMA* 201 (*And* is incorrectly listed in vol 8 [198,9.1]); *NTA* 2.576.

MSS—Lists none.

A-S Vers 1. *And* (A2.1).

2. *LS* 1.1 (AndrewBright, B3.3.1.1).

3. *LS* 1.2 (AndrewMor, B3.3.1.2).

Quots/Cits—Refs none.

This originally Greek legend (written according to the *RBMA* in Egypt around the turn of the fifth century, but dated perhaps to the sixth century in the *NTA*) relates the adventures of the two apostles among a race of cannibals. On the relationship of this work to the *Acta Andreae* (with implications for dating), see Flamion (1911) and the recent exchange between MacDonald (1986) and Prieur (1986).

In a study of the sources of the Old English *Andreas*, Schaar (GR 3404) distinguishes two main traditions of the legend, the "detailed and fantastic" and the "shorter and less miraculous" (p 15). He includes the Greek versions, the Latin prose version in the Casanatense Library, and the Old English *Andreas* (*And*) in the former group, and the Latin poetic version and the Old English prose versions (*LS* 1.1 and 1.2) in the latter. He also notes that the Greek versions sometimes contain details relevant to *Andreas* not found in the Latin versions (p 23). Brooks (GR 1420) asserts that the Latin poetic version "is in fact so free a rendering that it cannot be considered the source of any of the existing Old English versions" (p xvii), although he acknowledges that in using the proper names Achaia, Mirmidonia, and Plato it contains details not found in either the Greek versions or in the Casanatense. Baumler (1985) adds further general similarities between the Latin poetic version and *Andreas*.

The introduction in *Bright's Old English Grammar and Reader* (GR 314) to the Old English prose version found in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 198 (*LS* 1.1) notes that this version is "a very lightly abridged form of the text" in the Blickling collection (*LS* 1.2), but it "cannot be derived" directly

from the earlier manuscript (p 205). The editors also assert that the "Bonnet Fragment" is closer to their text than is the Latin version in the Casanatense, and they print this version, with one omission, in the apparatus of the text. Baumler (1985 p 71) suggests that there may have been "more than one model" for the Cambridge and Blickling versions.

The surviving Greek versions have been edited by Tischendorf (1851 pp 132–66) and by Bonnet (1898); Tischendorf's text has been translated by Walker (1873). Blatt has edited two Latin versions: one in prose is found in the twelfth-century MS, Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense 1104 (Bibliography Part I; translated by Allen and Calder 1976 pp 15–34); and the other in verse is found in the eleventh-century MS, Vatican, Vat. lat. 1274. The "Bonnet Fragment" (Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana, plut. I, tom. iii), an eleventh-century palimpsest, is also in prose; Blatt prints it opposite the Casanatense text (pp 13–15). A shorter Latin prose account occurs in the University of Bologna MS 1576; it has been edited by Baumler (1985 pp 90–112), who dates the MS to the eleventh century. Finally, much-condensed Latin versions occur in the *PS ABDIAS* (Fabricius 1719 vol 2 pp 457–59) and in GREGORY OF TOURS' *Liber de miraculis beati Andreae Apostoli* (*MGH.SRM* 1.827–28). For further discussions of *Andreas'* relationship to its sources, see Hill (GR 1468); Szittyá (1973); M.M. Walsh (1977 and 1981); Earl (1980); and Biggs (1988).

Passio Andreae [ANON.Pas.Andr.]: *RBMA* 199,6; *BHL* 428.

MSS—Lists none.

A-S Vers *ÆCHom* I, 38 (B1.1.40) Thorpe 586.29–598.32.

Quots/Cits—Refs none.

The *Passio* recounts the conflict between Andrew and Aegeas, the ruler in Achaia who attempts to force the Christians to worship idols; Andrew is eventually put to death on a cross. Zettel (1979 p 32) lists the *Passio* as item 139 in his reconstructed COTTON-CORPUS LEGENDARY. Although it does not occur in either the Cotton or the Corpus manuscript, it is included in Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 354 (twelfth century), and in the table of Salisbury, Cathedral Library 222 (olim Oxford, Bodleian Library Fell 1; HG 623). Förster (GR 5300, pp 21–22) notes that *ÆLFRIC* uses it in his homily for the Nativity of Andrew (*ÆCHom* I, 38); see also Zettel (1979 pp 166–71, and 244–46). Cross (1979b pp 27–28) cites it as a source for details about Andrew in the Old English *Martyrology* (B19.hg) not found in *PS ABDIAS*. Cross (1979a pp 170–71) also identifies it as a possible source for Cynewulf's comments about Andrew in *Fates* (A2.2; 16–22).

Item 66 from the *BOOK OF CERNE* (161.4–15; see *LITURGY*) is taken with minor changes from the *Passio* (24.8–26.1); see Kuypers (1902 p 233).

In addition to the text printed in Bonnet (Bibliography Part I), see also Fábrega Grau (1955 vol 2 pp 59–64).

Passio Bartholomaei [ANON.Pas.Bart.]: *RBMA* 207,1; *BHL* 1002; *NTA* 2.577.

MSS 1. London, BL Cotton Nero E.i: HG 344.

2. Salisbury, Cathedral Library 222 (olim Oxford, Bodleian Library Fell 1): HG 623.

Lists none.

A-S Vers *ÆCHom* I, 31 (B1.1.33).

Quots/Cits—Refs none.

The *Passio* tells how, by overthrowing idols in India, Bartholomew is able to convert one king, Polymius, before his brother, Astriges, has the apostle martyred. Zettel (1979 p 24) identified this work as item 89 in his reconstructed COTTON-CORPUS LEGENDARY: it occurs in both the London and Salisbury MSS. Förster (GR 5300, p 21) notes ÆLFRIC's use of this work for the first part of his homily on Bartholomew (*ÆCHom* I, 31) and Zettel (1979 pp 181–82) indicates several passages where readings from the Cotton MS are closer to Ælfric's version than the text in Mombritius. Herzfeld (GR 6364, p xl) points out that the entry on Bartholomew in the Old English *Martyrology* (B19.gb) draws on this account; see also Cross (1979b pp 19–20). Cross (1979a pp 172–74) considers this work as a possible source for details concerning Bartholomew in Cynewulf's *Fates* (A2.2; 42–49).

In addition to the text in Bonnet (Bibliography Part I), see also Mombritius (1910 vol 1 pp 140–44), and PS ABDIAS (Fabricius 1719 vol 2 pp 669–87).

Ps Clemens, Recognitiones [ANON.Recog./PS CLEMENS]: *RBMA* 208,3; *BHL* 6644–45; *CPG* 1015.5; *ODCC* 304; *NTA* 2.532–70.

MSS 1. Oxford, New College s.n.: HG 679.

2. Salisbury, Cath Lib 11: HG 701

3. ? Oxford, Trinity College 60.

4. ? London, BL Royal 6 B xiv.

Lists—A-S Vers none.

Quots/Cits 1. ALDH.Pros.uirg. 257.7–8: ANON.Recog. 6.2–3.

2. BEDA.Exp.Act.apost. V.xxxiv.71–73: ANON.Recog. 45.1–3.

3. BEDA.Retract.Act. V.xxxiv.37–40: ANON.Recog. 45.1–3.

4. BEDA.Comm.Gen. I.309–22: ANON.Recog. 23.21–24.9.

5. BEDA.Temp.rat V.61–69: ANON.Recog. 191.4–11.

Refs 1. ALDH.Pros.uirg. 257.13–15.

2. ALDH.Epist. 482.29.

The Anglo-Saxons would have known the *Recognitiones* through RUFINUS' translation of a lost Greek text dated to the third century (*ODCC* 304). The work relates the story of Clement, who is separated from his family early in life; who travels to meet Peter, becoming his disciple and witnessing his encounter with Simon Magus; and who finally is reunited with his family. But as Irmscher comments, the story is secondary to the didactic aim of the work, which attempts "to communicate the Christian doctrine or certain outward forms of it apologetically and systematically" (*NTA* 2.532). The narrative is adapted by various heretical groups (the *Recognitiones* is posited to be a reaction to heretical expansions of the earlier *Homilies* [*CPG* 1015.4]), and although Rufinus' translation omits unorthodox passages, a version is still condemned by the GELASIAN DECREE (263–64).

The Oxford, New College MS is listed in HG as a fragment; and the Salisbury MS is considered by Rehm (1965 p lxxvii) to be twelfth century. Ker (1976 p 25) includes it among group 6 of his breakdown of the MSS from Salisbury Cathedral, which he suggests are later than the first 5 groups. Rehm lists both the Oxford, Trinity College MS and the Royal MS as eleventh century, but neither appears in HG. Ogilvy (*BKE* p 117) notes one other MS, BL Add. 18400, but it is included by Rehm among the German MSS (1965 p xxii), and is not in HG.

Ogilvy (*BKE* p 116; corrected in 1984 p 296) states that the "Clemens" mentioned by ALCUIN in his *VERSUS DE PARTIBUS, REGIBUS ET SANCTIS EUBORICENSIS ECCLESIAE* (1552) is the author of this work; Lapidge (*ML* 1.12) identifies the reference as to Aurelius PRUDENTIUS Clemens, and the context of the name among Christian Latin poets supports his assertion; see also Godman (1982 p 125) who translates "Prudentius."

In both his commentary and retraction on the Acts of the Apostles, BEDE cites "Clemens" as his source for information. In addition to the two other uses listed above, Bede may draw on the *Recognitiones* elsewhere in his didactic works; see the *CCSL* 123.734. See also PS CLEMENS, *EPISTULA AD JACOBUM*.

In addition to Rehm (Bibliography Part I), the work also appears in *PG* 1.1207–1454.

Ps Clemens, Epistula ad Jacobum [ANON.Epist.Iac./PS CLEMENS]: *RBMA* 209,1; *BHL* 6647; *CPG* 1015.3; *ODCC* 304; *NTA* 2.532–70.

Ogilvy suggests that this work "may have been used by Bede" (*BKE* p 116) in explaining the succession of Laurence to Augustine as archbishop of Canterbury by recalling Peter's designation of Clement as his successor in Rome (*ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY* II.iv, 144.16–22). Ogilvy notes, however,

that Plummer (1896 vol 2 p 82) adduces other sources including Rufinus' preface to the *PS CLEMENS REGONITIONES* (4.29–5.10), and the *LIBER PONTIFICALIS* (123.5–8), both works that Bede is known to have used elsewhere. On the role of the Epistle in shaping this tradition, see Ullmann (1960), who mentions Bede's remarks and adds that *ALDHELM* also identifies Clement as the first pope in his prose *DE VIRGINITATE* (257.3–5).

Passio Jacobi Maioris [ANON.Pas.Iac.Mai.]: *RBMA* 213,11; *BHL* 4057.

MSS 1. London, BL Cotton Nero E.i: HG 344.

2. Salisbury, Cathedral Library 222 (olim Oxford, Bodleian Library Fell 1): HG 623.

3. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale 10861: HG 898.

Lists none.

A-S Vers *ÆCHom* II, 31–32 (B1.2.34).

Quots/Cits—*Refs* none.

In this *Passio*, James the Great preaching in Judea overcomes a magician named Hermogenes, but eventually is decapitated by king Herod. Zettel (1979 p 23) identifies it as item 74 in his reconstructed *COTTON-CORPUS LEGENDARY*: it occurs in the London and Salisbury *MSS*. Förster (GR 5300, p 23) notes that it is *ÆLFRIC*'s source for his homily on James (*ÆCHom* II, 31–32).

In addition to the edition in Fábrega Grau (Bibliography Part I), the work also appears in Mombricitus (1910 vol 2 pp 37–40); and in *PS ABDIAS* (Fabricius 1719 vol 2 pp 516–31).

Passio Jacobi Minoris [ANON.Pas.Iac.Min.]: *BHL* 4093; not in *RBMA*. See also *PS ABDIAS*, and *RUFINUS-EUSEBIUS, HISTORIA ECCLESIASTICA*.

MSS 1. London, BL Cotton Nero E.i: HG 344.

2. Salisbury, Cathedral Library 221 (olim Oxford, Bodleian Library Fell 4): HG 625.

Lists—*Refs* none.

James the Less' martyrdom, as this brief *Passio* relates, is brought about by the Pharisees who want the apostle to speak out against Christ; James uses the occasion to preach the Gospel. Zettel (1979 p 19) lists it as item 45 of his reconstructed *COTTON-CORPUS LEGENDARY*: it occurs in the London and Salisbury *MSS*. Cross (1979b pp 29–31) cites it, among others, for details in the Old English *Martyrology* on James (B19.ds).

In addition to the text in Fábrega Grau (Bibliography Part I), see also de Smedt, de Backer, van Ortoy, and van den Gheyn (1889 pp 136–37).

Ps Mellitus, Passio Johannis [ANON.Pas.Ioh./PS.MEL.]: *RBMA* 221; *BHL* 4320; see also *NTA* 2.204–06.

MSS Cambridge, Pembroke College 25: HG 131.

Lists none.

A-S Vers *ÆCHom* I, 4 (B1.1.5).

Quots/Cits *ALDH.Pros.uirg.*: see below.

Refs none.

Item 9 of the Pembroke MS (see the *HOMILIARY OF ST PÈRE DE CHARTRES*; and Cross 1987a p 22) includes, in a slightly shortened form with a homiletic introduction and conclusion, the opening miracles from this work (1241.18–1243.22). The following homily, on John's assumption, is drawn largely from the account in *PS ABDIAS*, and opens with a passage that overlaps with the *Passio* (1249.28–39).

Zettel (1979 p 33) lists this work as item 150 in his reconstructed *COTTON-CORPUS LEGENDARY*; it occurs only in Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 354 (twelfth century). Förster (GR 5300, pp 17–18) notes *ÆLFRIC*'s use of it in his homily on John's Assumption (*ÆCHom* I, 4); see also Zettel (1979 pp 160–62, 164–66, and 238–241) for further correspondences between *Ælfric*'s homily and this version.

In the prose *DE VIRGINITATE*, *ALDHELM* recounts the incidents of John restoring shattered gems (254.15–17), resurrecting a woman (254.17–255.3), and drinking poison (255.3–8), all recounted in the *Passio* (1242.20–1243.15, 1241.33–17, and 1248.5–23). Cross (1979a p 165) asserts that *BEDE* "had available, and disliked, the pseudo-Melitus account of John the Evangelist," but the exact comments in his *RETRACTIO* (I.48–85 and VIII.13–14) appear to be too general to support this claim.

In addition to the edition in the *PG* (Bibliography Part I), the work is also printed in Fabricius (1719 vol 3 pp 606–23), and in Fábrega Grau (1955 vol 2 pp 102–10).

Passio Marci [ANON.Pas.Marci]: *RBMA* 224,2; *BHL* 5276.

MSS 1. London, BL Cotton Nero E.i: HG 344.

2. Salisbury, Cathedral Library 221 (olim Oxford, Bodleian Library Fell 4): HG 625.

Lists none.

A-S Vers *ÆLS* (Mark, B1.3.16).

Quots/Cits *BEDA.Mart.*: see below.

Refs none.

The *Passio* describes how Mark establishes the faith in Egypt, particularly in Alexandria, before he is martyred by being dragged through the

streets of the city. Zettel (1979 p 19) identifies this work as item 43 of his reconstructed COTTON-CORPUS LEGENDARY: it occurs in the London and Salisbury MSS. Ott (GR 5351, pp 40–41) recognizes it as the source for ÆLFRIC's account of Mark's death (*ÆLS* Mark); see also Zettel (1979 pp 224–26). Quentin (1908 pp 85–86) shows the *passio* to be the source for BEDE's entry on Mark in his MARTYROLOGY.

In addition to Mombricitus (Bibliography Part I), the work is also printed in the *AS* (April, vol 3 pp 350–51).

Passio Matthaei [ANON.Pas.Mattaei]: *RBMA* 225,17; *BHL* 5690.

MSS 1. London, BL Cotton Nero E.i: HG 344.

2. Salisbury, Cathedral Library 222 (olim Oxford, Bodleian Library Fell 1): HG 623.

Lists none.

A-S Vers *ÆCHom* II, 37 (B1.2.40) 80–225.

Quots/Cits—Refs none.

After converting Ethiopia by driving out dragons and resurrecting the king's son, Matthew is eventually martyred at the altar when he attempts to prevent a succeeding king's marriage. Zettel (1979 p 26) identifies this work as item 104 of his reconstructed COTTON-CORPUS LEGENDARY: it appears in the London and Salisbury MSS. Förster (GR 5300, p 24) notes that it is the source for ÆLFRIC's discussion of Matthew's passion (*ÆCHom* II, 37). Herzfeld (GR 6364, p xli) cites it in discussing the entry on Matthew in the Old English *Martyrology* (B19.hf); see also Cross (1979b pp 23–25). Cross (1979a p 169) identifies this *passio* as a source for details about Matthew in Cynewulf's *Fates* (A2.2; 63–69).

In addition to Talamo Atenolfi's work (Bibliography Part I), a version of the work appears in the *PS ABDIAS* (Fabricius 1719 vol 2 pp 636–68).

Ps Linus, Passio Pauli [ANON.Pas.Paul./PS LINUS]: *RBMA* 230,4; *BHL* 6570.

MSS 1. ? London, BL Cotton Nero E.i: HG 344.

2. ? Salisbury, Cathedral Library 222 (olim Oxford, Bodleian Library Fell 1): HG 623.

Lists—Refs none.

Zettel (1979 p 22) lists a "Passio S. Pauli apostoli" as item 68 in his reconstructed COTTON-CORPUS LEGENDARY, and he identifies this text as similar to *BHL* 6570 and 6574, the version that occurs in *PS ABDIAS* (Fabricius 1719 vol 2 pp 441–56).

The editors of BEDE's DE ORTHOGRAPHIA (600) refer to chapter 8, line

14 (31.15?) of this work, but the correspondence appears to be a single word.

Epistle of Paul to the Laodiceans [ANON.Epist.Laod.]: *RBMA* 233; *NTA* 2.128–32.

MSS 1. London, BL Royal 1.E.viii: HG 449.

2. ? Cambridge, Trinity College B.5.2 (148): HG 169.

Lists—Quots/Cits none.

Refs *ÆLet* 4 (Sigeweard, B1.8.4) 948.

This short apocryphal letter is largely a tissue of quotations from the other Pauline epistles. In his catalog, James (1900–04 vol 1 p 186) asserts that the MS B.5.2 "must have contained the Epistle to the Laodiceans," apparently basing his judgment on the explicit following the Epistle to the Hebrews at the end of the MS: "epistole Pauli numero xvcim expl."

In his letter to Sigeweard concerning the Old and New Testament, ÆLFRIC attributes fifteen epistles to Paul, listing this work.

Lightfoot (1879 pp 282–84) provides a list of MS including this epistle. It was known in Ireland, appearing in the Book of Armagh; see McNamara (1975 pp 103–04).

Ps Marcellus, Passio Petri et Pauli [ANON.Pas.Pet.Paul./PS MARCEL.]: *RBMA* 251,3; *BHL* 6657–59.

MSS—*Lists* none.

A-S Vers 1. *LS* 32 (Peter & Paul, B3.3.32).

2. *ÆCHom* I, 26 (B1.1.28), Thorpe 374.12–384.19.

Quots/Cits—Refs none.

In this account, Peter and Paul oppose Simon Magus before Nero, and after a number of other exchanges, end his magic flight through their prayers; the two are then martyred—Peter hanged head down on a cross, and Paul beheaded. Förster (GR 6173, pp 185–93) notes that BLICKLING HOMILY 15 (*LS* 32) is a translation of this work. Förster (GR 5300, pp 18–20) also points out that ÆLFRIC uses this work in the second half of his homily on the passion of Peter and Paul (*ÆCHom* I, 26). Cross (GR 691, pp 90–92 and 97–100) shows that Ælfric used this work to structure his homily for Rogation Monday (*ÆCHom* II, 21, B1.2.24). Cross (1979a p 170) notes that the pairing of the two in Cynewulf's *Fates* (A2.2; 11b–15) may "hint" at the use of this account.

Item 62 in the BOOK OF CERNE (158.10–15; see LITURGY) corresponds to a passage from this text (173.3–8); see Kuypers (1902 p 233).

In addition to Lipsius (Bibliography Part I), the work is also printed in

Fábrega Grau (1955 vol 2 pp 283–93). For the knowledge of this work in Ireland, see McNamara (1975 pp 99–101).

Ps Marcellus, *Epistolae I et II ad Fratres Nerei et Achillem* [ANON.Epist.Ner.Achil.]: *BHL* 6060; not in *RBMA*.

see *ACTA SANCTORUM*.

Conflictio apostolorum Petri et Pauli cum Simone Mago et Passionibus eorum.

Ogilvy (*BKE* p 72) takes this title from a list of books supposedly given by Gregory to St Augustine's, Canterbury. The list is recorded in the fifteenth century *Historia monasterii S. Augustini Cantuariensis* by Thomas of Elmham (*BEH* 2158; *RS* 8.96–99), but Ogilvy offers no evidence that it reflects books from the Anglo-Saxon period.

Actus Petri cum Simone [ANON.Acta.Pet.]: *RBMA* 235,1; *BHL* 6656; *NTA* 2.259–322.

MSS—*Refs* none.

This work, which is preserved in its most complete form in a Latin MS, Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare CLVIII (sixth-seventh century), was composed in Greek at the end of the second century; see *NTA* 2.275. Schneemelcher (*NTA* 2.262) considers the Acts of Peter to be a more appropriate title, and he discusses its relationship to other early acts, including the *PS CLEMENTINE RECOGNITIONES*. The Latin text focusses primarily on Peter's confrontation with Simon Magus (chapters 2–29) and his martyrdom (chapters 30–39); the second part circulated also independently (*RBMA* 245,1).

Lapidge (in Lapidge and Rosier 1985 p 239 note 42) suggests that ALDHELM may have drawn the details from this work in the section on Peter in the *CARMINA ECCLESIASTICA*.

Passio Petri [ANON.Pas.Petri]: *BHL* 6664.

MSS 1. ? London, BL Cotton Nero E.i: HG 344.

2. ? Salisbury, Cathedral Library 222 (olim Oxford, Bodleian Library Fell 1): HG 623.

Lists—*Refs* none.

Zettel (1979 p 22) lists a "Passio S. Petri apostoli" as item 67 in his reconstructed COTTON-CORPUS LEGENDARY, and he identifies this text as similar to *BHL* 6664. Förster (GR 5300, pp 18–21) links ÆLFRIC's Latin interjections opposing other traditions concerning Paul's and Peter's passion

(CATHOLIC HOMILIES I, 26, B1.1.26; Thorpe 374.25–27 and 382.28–29) to this text and to the *PASSIO PAULI*. See also Zettel (1979 pp 177–78).

In addition to Mombritius (Bibliography Part I), a version of the work appears in *PS ABDIAS* (Fabricius 1719 vol 2 pp 390–92 and 402–41).

Passio Philippi [ANON.Pas.Phil.]: *RBMA* 254; *BHL* 6814.

MSS 1. London, BL Cotton Nero E.i: HG 344.

2. Salisbury, Cathedral Library 221 (olim Oxford, Bodleian Library Fell 4): HG 635.

3. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale 10861: HG 898.

Lists none.

A-S Vers *ÆCHom* II, 18 (B1.2.21) 1–60.

Quots/Cits—*Refs* none.

In this brief passio, Philip converts the people of Scythia by driving out a dragon and resurrecting the people it has killed, and then travels to Asia where he is martyred. Zettel (1979 p 19) identifies the work as item 46 in his reconstructed COTTON-CORPUS LEGENDARY: it appears in the London and Salisbury *MSS*. Förster (GR 5300, p 22) notes that the material on Philip in ÆLFRIC's homily on Philip and James (*ÆCHom* II, 18) is from this account; see also Zettel (1979 pp 186–87).

Herzfeld (GR 6364, p xxxviii) discusses this account as the source for details about Philip in the Old English *Martyrology* (B19.ch); see also Cross (1979b pp 28–29). Cross (1979a pp 166–67) cites this work as a source for the *Fates* (A2.2; 37b–41), and mentions one detail—that Philip was crucified—which occurs in Mombritius (Bibliography Part I; 385.41–42), but not in *PS ABDIAS* (Fabricius vol 2 1719 pp 738–42). Lapidge (in Lapidge and Rosier 1985 p 241 note 64) notes that in the section on Philip in his *CARMINA ECCLESIASTICA*, ALDHELM departs from his main source (ISIDORE'S DE ORTU) in claiming that Philip preaches in Scythia; Lapidge identifies *PS ABDIAS* as a possible source.

Passio Simonis et Judae [ANON.Pas.Sim.Iud.]: *BHL* 7749–50; see *RBMA* 255,14.

MSS—*Lists* none.

A-S Vers *ÆCHom* II, 38 (B1.2.41).

Quots/Cits—*Refs* none.

Simon and Jude convert Persia by overcoming two magicians, and performing other miracles; they are eventually martyred when they travel to the provinces to continue their missionary work. Zettel (1979 p 28) includes the *Passio* as item 121 in his reconstructed COTTON-CORPUS LEGENDARY.

Although it does not occur in either the Cotton or the Corpus MSS, it is included in Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 354 (twelfth century), and in the table of Salisbury, Cathedral Library 222 (olim Oxford, Bodleian Fell 1: HG 623). Förster (GR 5300, pp 24–25) notes that it is ÆLFRIC's source for his homily on Simon and Jude (*ÆCHom* II, 38). See also Zettel (1979 pp 195–98). Herzfeld (GR 6364, p xli) identifies it as relevant to the entry in the Old English *Martyrology* (B19.ih); see also Cross (1979b pp 25–27). Cross (1979a pp 169–70) considers it a source for Cynewulf's *Fates* (A2.2; 75–84).

In addition to Mombricitus (Bibliography Part I), a version of this work appears in *PS ABDIAS* (Fabricius 1719 vol 2 pp 608–36).

Acta Thomae: *RBMA* 259: see *PASSIO THOMAE*.

Passio Thomae [ANON.Pas.Thom.]: *RBMA* 259,8; *BHL* 8136; see *NTA* 2.425–42.

MSS—*Lists* none.

A-S Vers *ÆLS* (Thomas, B1.3.34; 13–424).

Quots/Cits none.

Refs ? *ÆCHom* II, 39.2 (B1.2.43) 7–9.

The original *Acta Thomae*, composed in Syriac and surviving also in Greek, are closely linked to Gnostic sects (see *NTA* 2.429–41). Two Latin adaptations, the *Passio* and the *De miraculis beati Thomae apostoli* (also printed in Zelzer 1977, but previously known from *PS ABDIAS* vol 2 pp 687–736), have been largely stripped of their overt gnostic content (Zelzer 1977 pp xi–xxiii). Zelzer dates the two to the fourth century (p xxv).

Zettel (1979 p 33) lists this work as item 146 in his reconstructed COTTON-CORPUS LEGENDARY. Although it does not occur in either the Cotton or the Corpus manuscript, it is included in Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 354 (twelfth century), Hereford, Cathedral Library P 7 vi (twelfth century; see Bannister 1927 p 172) and in the table of Salisbury, Cathedral Library 222 (olim Oxford, Bodleian Library Fell 1: HG 623).

As Loomis (GR 5358, p 7) notes, ÆLFRIC adapts this work in his *LIVES OF SAINTS* (*ÆLS* Thomas), shortening and omitting some sections. Ælfric's possible reference to this work in his "Apology" in his *CATHOLIC HOMILIES II*—"the Passion of Thomas we leave unwritten because it was long ago translated from Latin into English, in verse"—is further linked to this text by the reference to an exchange between the saint and a cupbearer, an account that Augustine condemns; Ælfric again mentions this incident at the beginning of the version in the *Lives of Saints*. See also Zettel (1979 pp 259–62).

Cross (1979a pp 167–69) concludes that the *Fates* (A2.2; 50–62) probably draws on the *passio*. Herzfeld (GR 6364, p 240) identifies it as the source for the entry on Thomas in the Old English *Martyrology* (B19.jn); Cross (1979b pp 21–23) agrees, and notes further that the *PS ABDIAS* account does not include many relevant details.

In the prose *DE VIRGINITATE* (255.20–23), ALDHELM quotes a speech by Thomas concerning virginity, but his source has not yet been located (see Lapidge and Herren 1979 pp 194–95).

There is some evidence that the Irish knew the original *Acta Thomae*; see McNamara (1975 pp 118–19).

IV. APOCRYPHAL APOCALYPSES

Shepherd of Hermas [ANON.Past.Herm.]: *RBMA* 267; *CPG* 1052; *GCS* 86–87; *DACL* 6.2265–90; see also *NTA* 2.629–42; *ODCC* 641–42; *KVS* HER.

MSS 1. Düsseldorf, Landes- und Stadtbibliothek B. 215 + C. 118 + Staatsarchiv Fragm. 20: HG 819 (Staatsarchiv fragment is not in HG).

2. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 265: HG 73.

Lists—*A-S Vers* none.

Quots/Cits see below.

Refs *BEDA*.Exp.Act.apost. 12.15: Past.Hermas Mand. VI.ii.2–5: see below.

The *Shepherd of Hermas* was composed in Greek at Rome in the second century, or perhaps as early as the late first century. The *NTA* describes the work as a "Pseudo-Apocalypse," "since it includes no disclosures of the eschatological future or of the world beyond" (p 630; see also pp 634–38), but its apocalyptic intent has been reasserted by other scholars (Bauckham 1974 pp 29–30; Hellholm 1980; and Osiek 1986). Hermas, who describes himself as a freed Christian slave who became a merchant and who later suffered persecution, is identified as the brother of the bishop of Rome in the Muratorian Canon and other sources, but scholars are not agreed on how much of the work can be attributed to Hermas himself. The *Shepherd* is traditionally divided into 5 Visions, 12 Mandates, and 10 Similitudes, and is thought to have been combined from two originally independent books (Visions 1–4; and Visions 5–Similitudes 8, supplemented by Similitudes 9–10; see *NTA* pp 633–34 and Barnard 1968 p 32), or according to Giet (1963) three different works (Visions 1–4; Similitude 9; and the Mandates and Similitudes 1–8).

The *Shepherd* was regarded as Scripture in the early Greek Church (*ODCC* 641). JEROME, in *DE VIRIS ILLUSTRIBUS*, says that it was virtually unknown in the West (*PL* 23.626), but the *Shepherd* is cited or mentioned

by various early Latin authors (see De Gebhardt and Harnack, *Bibliography Part I* pp lxi-lxx; *DS* 7.332-33; Courcelle 1969 pp 91, 94-95, and 228), not always favorably, although a favorable judgment by ORIGEN was repeated by SEDULIUS SCOTTUS (see De Gebhardt and Harnack pp lxiv-lxv, note 1). Dronke (1981 pp 37-38) argues that St Patrick knew the work.

Two Latin versions have survived: the Vulgata (V or L¹, dating from the second century, surviving in several manuscripts and fragments) and the Palatina (P or L², dating from the fourth or fifth century, surviving in two fifteenth-century MSS and in the Düsseldorf fragment). The Vulgata includes the end of the book, lacking in the Greek manuscripts. On the relationship between the Latin and Greek versions see Carlini (1983). On the Latin versions see Mazzini and Lorenzini (1981); on the Palatina version see also Mazzini (1980). For lists of the Latin manuscripts see *GCS* and De Gebhardt and Harnack (*Bibliography Part I*, pp xiv ff). On the Düsseldorf MS see *CLA* 8.1187 and Coens (1956 pp 90-91), who identifies the fragment (apparently in the 2 leaves in C.118) as mandata in the Palatina version. I have not been able to confirm Ogilvy's statement (*BKE* p 157) that St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 151, pt 3 "may go back to an English exemplar."

The brief extract (Mand. IV.1) in the Cambridge MS apparently corresponds to the *COLLECTIO CANONUM HIBERNENSIS* 46.15 (see Bateson 1895 p 720); the *Hibernensis* also has other extracts from Hermas; this particular extract occurs in related canonical collections, including Orléans, Bibliothèque Municipale 221 (193) and Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale 3182. Another extract (Sim. II) occurs in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale nouv. acq. lat. 763 (see Omont 1906 pp 355-57).

BEDE, commenting on the reference to guardian angels in Acts 12.15, states "quod unusquisque nostrum habeat angelos et in libro Pastoris et in multis sanctae scripturae locis inuenitur" (*CCSL* 121.159). The reference is probably to Mandate 6, as Laistner indicates in the apparatus of his edition (*Bibliography Part I*), rather than to Vision 5, as Laistner (1933 p 83) had earlier suggested. Laistner (1933 p 83) states that "it was undoubtedly [the Vulgata version] to which Bede had access," but the Düsseldorf MS suggests that if Bede did know the work at first hand, it might well have been in the Palatina version. According to Jenkins (1966 p 182), however, "we may doubt if he knew the book except at second hand," since he does not refer to it on the significance of the stones of the Temple in *DE TEMPLO*. Ogilvy (*BKE* p 157) thinks it "likely" that Bede knew the work first hand, in view of the Düsseldorf fragments, which Lowe considers to have been written probably in the north of England. But the passage to which Bede refers on the guardian angels was cited or paraphrased in several patristic works, including ORIGEN, *DE PRINCIPIIS* III.ii.4 (in *RUFINUS'* translation; *PG*

11.309 and *GCS* 22.251) with attribution to "Pastoris liber" (cf. Daniélou 1976 pp 80-81), and CASSIAN, *CONLATIONES* VIII.xvii.2 (*CSEL* 13.233) with attribution to "liber Pastoris" and in reference to Acts 12.15 (see Courcelle 1969 p 228). De Gebhardt and Harnack (*Bibliography Part I* p LXVII and note 4) already suggested that Bede's reference, as well as one in the *Visio Wettini*, was taken over from Cassian. The passage also appears as a separate extract (but attributed to Jerome) in London, BL Cotton Nero A.ii folio 35 (*CLA* 2.186; beyond the part listed in HG; see *BHM* vol 4A, p 21 which does not identify the source of the excerpt).

The same passage on the guardian angels has been cited by Menner (*GR* 4337, p 143) as an early example of the conception of the good and bad angels appearing in the poetic *Solomon and Saturn* (*MSol*, A13) with reference to similar descriptions in *HomU* 9 (*VercHom* 4; B3.4.9) and *GuthA* (A3.2).

For the Greek text, in addition to Whittaker (*Bibliography Part I*), see the edition by R. Joly (1958), which replaces the traditional divisions with consecutively numbered chapters. For English translations see Crombie (1905) and Snyder (1968).

Charles D. Wright

Apocalypse of the Virgin [ANON.Apoc.Mariae]: *RBMA* 273.

MSS—A-S *Vers* none.

Quots/Cits see below.

Refs none.

The Apocalypse of the Virgin, probably composed in Greek in the second half of the fourth century (W. Wright 1865 p 7) exists in numerous Eastern languages. Although *RBMA* does not include any Latin version, a short Latin recension has been edited by Wenger (*Bibliography Part I*).

One detail—Mary's role in aiding condemned souls—in two Old English homilies—*HomU* 6 (*VercHom* 15, B3.4.6) and *NicD* and *NicE* (B8.5.3.2 and B8.5.3.3—but see *GOSPEL OF NICODEMUS*) may go back to this work. In the Apocalypse, Mary is taken to hell with the apostles after her death so that they can view its torments; they plead with Christ, and He eventually grants a respite for the suffering souls. In the Anglo-Saxon texts, Mary, Michael, and Peter plead for the damned after the Judgment, and each is granted a third of the condemned souls. For further details, see Clayton (1986c).

ÆLFRIC was presumably familiar with this vernacular version, and objected that neither Mary nor any other saint could save those condemned by Christ (*ÆCHom* II, 44, B1.2.48; 184-95).

For the knowledge of this text in Ireland, see Donahue (1942 p 9).

Mary Clayton

Visio Sancti Pauli [ANON.Vis.Pauli]: *RBMA* 275-76; *BHL* 6580-82; *NTA* 2.755-98.

MSS ? Vatican, Pal. lat. 220.

Lists none.

A-S Vers *HomM* 1 (B3.5.1).

Quots/Cits none.

Refs 1. ALDH. Pros. uirg. 256.7-14: see below.

2. *ÆCHom* II 22 (B1.2.26) 14-16: see below.

Although the *NTA* calls this work the "Apocalypse of Paul" to emphasize its close filiations with other apocalypses such as the Apocalypse of Peter, the title *Visio Sancti Pauli*, here accepted, is more common among Anglo-Saxonists. The Latin tradition, which contains long versions and eleven redactions, has been largely established by Silverstein (1935, 1959, and 1976); see also the *NTA* 2.755-59. The Vatican MS, in an Anglo-Saxon hand of the ninth century, has recently been published by Dwyer (1988 pp 121-38), who identifies it as redaction XI. According to Silverstein (1959 p 212) redaction IV has "has special currency in England (perhaps even its origin there)"; the known MSS of this redaction, however, are later than our period (see Silverstein 1935 pp 220-21 for a list of MSS).

The *Visio*, translated into Latin somewhere between the fourth and sixth centuries, was popular in Anglo-Saxon England as an accessible and instructive guide to the fate of the soul at the moment of death. One clear indication of its popularity is the vigor with which it was condemned by two of the most articulate voices of the period: ALDHELM, writing around the turn of the eighth century, spurns the work by categorizing it with "other absurdities of the apocrypha"; and ÆLFRIC, writing three centuries later, repudiates it as "a false composition."

Only the first part of the *Visio* was actually translated into Old English, existing in a unique copy, *HomM* 1. Luiselli Fadda (1974) has concluded that the translation follows a Long Latin Version, and Healey (1978) has argued that none of the extant Long Latin Versions is its source. Matter found in the Old English, but lacking in the Long Latin and yet confirmed as original by the Russian and Syriac versions establishes in a positive way the existence of another Latin recension, the source of the Old English.

A number of Old English texts are indebted to the *Visio Sancti Pauli* for significant motifs as well as several minor themes. The incident of the

going-out of souls can be found in *Bede* 5 (B9.6.7; pp 436-42), *GuthA* (A3.2; 1-29), *HomM* 5 (B3.5.5), *HomS* 5 (B3.2.5), and *HomS* 31 (B3.2.31); most recently Acker (1986) has analyzed this motif in *HomS* 14 (*BlHom* 4, B3.2.14). The address of the soul to the body can be found in *HomM* 8 (B3.5.8), *HomM* 14.1 (B3.5.14.1), *HomM* 14.2 (B3.5.14.2), *HomS* 6 (Ass 14, B3.2.6), *HomU* 9 (*VercHom* 4, B3.4.9), *HomU* 26 (Nap 29, B3.4.26), *HomU* 55 (B3.4.55), and *Soul I* and *II* (A2.3 and 3.19). The respite of the damned, which is the climax of Paul's journey to hell in the *Visio*, appears domesticated in *GuthA* (A3.2; 205-14), *HomM* 8, *HomM* 14.2, *HomU* 35.1 (Nap 43, B3.4.35.1), *HomU* 35.2 (Nap 44, B3.4.35.2), *HomU* 55, and *Soul I* and *II*. The correspondence of punishment to sin, which conveys a straightforward justice in the *Visio Sancti Pauli*, is appropriated by Old English writers in *HomS* 14, *HomS* 42 (B3.2.42), *HomU* 37 (Nap 46, B3.4.37), *Let* 1 (B6.1), and *LS* 25 (Michael-Mor, B3.3.25). Moreover, minor influences of the *Visio* may be seen in the detail of men with tongues of iron in *HomS* 4 (*VercHom* 9, B3.2.4), *HomU* 35.1, *HomU* 12.2 (Willard, B3.4.12.2). And, as Hill (GR 3778) has suggested, the *Visio* is a possible source for the northwest direction of hell in *GenB* (A1.1; 275). Despite its censure by Aldhelm and Ælfric, Anglo-Saxon homilists and poets drew upon the *Visio Sancti Pauli* to articulate the direct relationship between human deeds and the fate of the soul.

Finally, the vexed question of the relationship of the hell scene in the *Visio* with the hell scene in the Blickling Homily on the dedication of St Michael's church (*LS* 25) and with the description of Grendel's mere in *Beowulf* (*Beo*, A4.1; 1367-76) has been opened once again by R.L. Collins (1984) who observes that the vocabulary of the Blickling homilist here is closer to the *Visio* than to *Beowulf*. He cautiously concludes that if there is any influence, it may be from the homilist to *Beowulf*, the reverse of what has usually been thought.

For bibliography on the Old English *Visio Sancti Pauli*, see GR 4365, 6235, 6239, 6240; and Healey (1978 pp 96-98). The most complete Long Latin Version is published by James from Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale nouv. acq. lat. 1631 (Bibliography Part I). Silverstein (Bibliography Part I) publishes a second fragment of this version from St Gall, Stadtbibliothek 317; and a related fragment from Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 362. The Latin redactions have been discussed and published by Silverstein (1935, 1959, 1962, and 1976); see also his review (1981) of Healey (1978). As noted above, redaction eleven is published by Dwyer from the Vatican MS (Bibliography Part I). The work was also known to the Irish; see McNamara (1975 pp 108-09). A new edition of the Armenian version is CCSA 3.

A. diPaolo Healey

Apocalypse of Thomas [ANON.Apoc.Thom.]: *RBMA* 280; *CPL* 796a; *NTA* 2.798–803. See also *COLLECTANEA BEDAE*.

MSS ? Vatican, Pal. Lat. 220.

Lists none.

A-S Vers 1. *HomU* 12 (B3.4.12).

2. *HomU* 6 (*VercHom* 22, B3.4.6).

3. *HomS* 26 (*BlHom* 7, B3.2.26).

4. *HomS* 44 (B3.2.44).

5. *HomS* 33 (B3.2.33).

Quots/Cits—Refs none.

This Apocalypse, which purports to be a revelation to the apostle concerning the end of the world, survives in two recensions. The longer recension alludes to fifth-century events as contemporary, and the earliest witness of the shorter recension is in a MS also dated to this century (Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Lat. 16; *CLA* 3.396). The Vatican MS, in a ninth-century Anglo-Saxon hand (McNally 1979 pp 121–22), represents the longer version. The work is condemned in the *GELASIAN DECREE* (293).

Förster (GR 6224) reached several conclusions about the relationship of the Old English translations of the Apocalypse to the two main Latin recensions: 1) the five homilies represent four independent versions (Förster considers *HomS* 33 and 44 as one version); 2) 1, 2, and 3 follow the longer Latin recension closely enough to be called translations; 3) 1 and 2 incorporate almost the entire apocalypse whereas 3, 4, and 5 use only the signs of Doomsday; 4) 4 and 5 show no trace of the interpolated Latin recension.

Probably related to the Apocalypse is the tradition of the Fifteen Signs before Judgment (*Notes* 22, B24.22). Although the Apocalypse lists signs for only seven days before Judgment, the use of a numbered sequence and the similarity in many of the signs suggest that the Fifteen Signs developed from this work. Heist (1952) specifically argues that the early Middle Irish poem *Saltair na Rann* provides the transition; however, the question remains open to new evidence such as the discovery of manuscripts of the *COLLECTANEA BEDAE* in which a Latin version of the work appears (*PL* 94.555).

Evidence for an earlier knowledge of these works is difficult to establish. *ChristC* (A3.1), often ascribed to the ninth century, does not list signs for the days preceding Judgment, but it contains in its description of the destruction of the world details found in these traditions. The difficulty in identifying exclusive echoes of either Apocalypse or the Fifteen signs in poetic texts arises because the signs often have some basis in biblical passages such as Mt 24.30. See, however, the suggestion by Cross (1982 p 105 note

10) that the Apocalypse may be the ultimate source for the phrase “mare siccabitur” in *PS AUGUSTINE HOMILY* 251.

Förster (GR 2224, p 10) states that the Latin MSS in Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Lat. 16 (fragment) and Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 4563 (both in *Bibliography Part I*) represent the uninterpolated tradition; and that Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare 1 (fragment), and Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 4585 (both in *Bibliography Part I*) represent the interpolated tradition. James (1953 pp 556–62) translates these versions. For other MSS, see Förster (GR 2224, pp 9–10). For bibliography on the Old English versions of the Apocalypse, see GR 248, 923, 3343, 5300, and 6239; and on the Old English version of the Fifteen Signs, see GR 626. For further information on the Irish evidence, see McNamara (1975 pp 119–21).

Apocrypha Priscillianistica [ANON.Apoc.Pris.]: *RBMA* 283; *CPL* 790–95; *BCLL* 1252; *KVS AN* Bruyne.

MSS 1. London, BL Royal 5.E.xiii: HG 459.

2. Salisbury, Cathedral Library 9: HG 699.

Lists—A-S Vers none.

Quots/Cits *HomS* 44 (B3.2.44, ed. Bazire and Cross 1982) 51.91–96: see below.

Refs none.

The *Apocrypha Priscillianistica* consist of six texts published by De Bruyne (1907) from Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek Aug. CCLIV (*CLA* 8.1100), the first six items in a larger compilation headed in the manuscript “incipit collectario de diversis sententiis.” The Royal MS includes the beginning of De Bruyne’s item 6 (*Liber “canon in ebreica” Hieronimi presbiteri*, *CPL* 795; see also *BHM* 403 and Bischoff 1976 p 159 note 126) in an expanded version, before breaking off; see Warner and Gilson (1921 vol 1 p 116). The Salisbury MS includes item 4 (*Homilia de die iudicii*, *CPL* 793); see Schenkl (1969 V. Salisbury, p 5).

De Bruyne’s theory of Priscillianist origins for these pieces has since been abandoned (see Vollmann 1965 p 48), but M.R. James (1918–19 p 16) remarked that they “appear to be from a Celtic workshop,” an opinion supported by many other scholars; for details, see C. Wright (1987a pp 135–36), and Frede (*KVS* 1981 p 78). C. Wright (forthcoming in *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies*) outlines the parallels with Irish traditions, including the seven heavens apocryphon, extracts from *HIBERNO-LATIN COMMENTARIES* (first remarked by Dumville 1973 p 327), and other themes and enumerations paralleled in Hiberno-Latin compilations, including the *LIBER DE NUMERIS*,

the FLORILEGIUM FRISINGENSE, the CATACHESIS CELTICA, and the homilies IN NOMINE DEI SUMMI.

Item 2 is an epitome of the so-called Seven Heavens apocryphon, which describes (in broken and confused fashion) the journey and purgation of the soul through a series of seven heavens, assigning names to each heaven as well as to the doors of each (for other lists of the seven heavens in Hiberno-Latin texts, see Cross 1986a pp 78–79 and 90–91). The apocryphon survives in variant forms in three Irish texts (Vision of Adamnan, Evernew Tongue, and an excerpt in the Liber Flavus Fergusiorum, ed. Mac Niocaill 1956) and in Old English in *HomU* 12.2 (Willard; B3.4.12.2; this homily also contains an Old English version of the APOCALYPSE OF THOMAS). The relationship between the Irish texts and the Latin fragment has been studied by James (1918, with suggested emendations for the Latin fragment), Seymour (1923, with a translation of the Latin, pp 22–23; see also Seymour 1927 and 1930 pp 112–20), Dando (1972), Dumville (1977/78) and Stevenson (1982). Willard (GR 6235, pp 1–30) provides a detailed examination of the relationship between these versions and *HomU* 12.2, in addition to a passage in *HomS* 5 (B3.2.5) on the descent of the soul through 12 dragons and 12 circles of hell (see pp 24–28).

C. Wright (forthcoming in *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*) shows that a Judgment theme in item 4—in which Christ demands a pledge for each man's thoughts, words, and deeds, and each responds that he has nothing to pledge but his soul—is the ultimate source for a closely similar passage in *HomS* 44 (B3.2.44, ed. Bazire and Cross 1982; 51.91–96), where the Old English term *wed* corresponds to the Latin *area* (= *arrha*). A similar idea occurs in several other Old English homilies. Luiselli Fadda (1977 p 101) printed part of the theme from item 4 opposite a passage from *HomS* 32 (B3.2.32), but here there are no close verbal parallels with the Latin, and only one other homily, *HomS* 25 (B3.2.25, ed. Evans 1981; 142.351–53) uses the distinctive term *wed*. C. Wright points out, however, that Cynewulf's *Elene* (*El*, A2.6; 1281b–86a) echoes the theme with the phrase *wed gesyllan* and the “thought, word, deed” triad.

J.E. Cross, who noted item 4 in the Salisbury MS, has also noted its occurrence in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 19410. C. Wright (1988b pp 228–29) points out that substantial portions of the Apocrypha Priscillianistica (including part of item 4, but not the Judgment passage) also occur in Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek 199 (*CLA* 7.875). Item 3 includes parallels with the APOCALYPSE OF THOMAS (see under Apocrypha). The Karlsruhe MS also contains a text of the THREE UTTERANCES apocryphon (see under MISCELLANEOUS).

Charles D. Wright

AUGUSTINE

[Only one work has been included in this *Trial Version*.]

Confessiones [AVG.Confess.]: *CPL* 251.

- MSS* 1. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 253: HG 71.
 2. Cambridge, Trinity College, B.3.25 (104): HG 163.
 3. London, BL, Harley 3080: HG 434.
 4. London, Lambeth Palace Library 414 (excerpts): HG 516.
 5. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 815 (*SC* 2759): HG 603.
 6. Salisbury, Cathedral Library 6: HG 697.
 7. Salisbury, Cathedral Library 118: HG 723.

Lists—A-S vers none.

- Quots/Cits* 1. BEDA.Orthogr.746: AVG.Confess. I.ix.15.
 2. BEDA.Temp.rat. V.45–48: AVG.Confess. XII.20–29.
 3. BEDA.Nat.rer. I.1: AVG.Confess. XII.7–8.
 4. BEDA.Nat.rer. II.1: AVG.Confess. XII.8.
 5. BEDA.Comm.Gen.: see below.

Refs ANON.Lib.precum.Cerne: see below.

This is clearly Augustine's most popular and widely read work, although its popularity stems largely from the Renaissance after Petrarch took it along on his famous climb of Mount Ventoux. Moderns prize the work for its ruthless psychological investigation of a sinner redeemed and for its abundant spirituality; scholars use it for its valuable biographical data. This fascination with the work is, however, rather late.

Augustine wrote the *Confessiones* between 397 and 400. Books 1–9 contain his spiritual autobiography; book 10 describes his moral and spiritual state at the time he wrote the book; and books 11–13 contain a meditation on time and eternity and the relation of God to the created world. It is a testimony to how the book was regarded that its most extensive use by BEDE in his COMMENTARY ON GENESIS (see *CCSL* 118A. 254 for a list of eight quotations) and all of his citations are from books 12–13. Indeed, only the references in Bede's DE ORTHOGRAPHIA are from Books 1–9. The reference in the BOOK OF CERNE (see LITURGY) appears on p 122 therein.

Joseph F. Kelly

BEDE

Bede, Anglo-Saxon England's foremost Anglo-Latin author, "father of English scholarship," "father of English history," "teacher of the whole Middle Ages," produced works in every discipline of the monastic school system. His educational treatises—basic schoolbooks and reference works—gave the Anglo-Saxons access to classical authorities and provided early medieval supplements to late antique manuals. His scientific writings on computus and chronology established a new norm. His commentaries on the Bible offered Anglo-Saxon readers a carefully edited and annotated synthesis of patristic sources, particularly the four Fathers of the Western Church. His historical writings formed a model for later historiographers and are still the principal sources, along with the *ANGLO-SAXON CHRONICLE*, for information on England before the Conquest. By including a fairly complete bibliography of his works at the end of the *HISTORIA ECCLESIASTICA* (V.xxiv), Bede furnished a list to his readers of writings available for use.

Teacher, exegete, historian, and saintly monk, Bede was cited as "magister," "nostrae cathegita terrae," "se snotera lareow," "breoma bocera," "se trahtnere," "se halga Beda"; both in England and on the Continent he was ranked on a footing with the Fathers of the Church; see BONIFACE (*EHD* 180), CUTHBERT (*EHD* 185), LUL (*EHD* 188), ALCUIN (*MGH ECA* 337.5, 360.16–20, 443.8) and ÆLFRIC (in the Preface to the *FIRST SERIES OF CATHOLIC HOMILIES*, and in his letters to Wulfsgie [*ÆL* 1, B1.8.1; 16] and to Sigefyrth [*ÆL* 5, B1.8.5; 209]). Wherever Bede's name was associated with a work, scribes gave the work special attention; see *CCSL* 123A.xv and 185, and *CCSL* 123B.242.

Continental MSS of Bede's works are numerous, but, despite his primary importance for Anglo-Saxon culture, his undoubted influence on writers such as Alfred and Ælfric, and the honor they paid him, insular MSS of his works (except for the *HISTORIA ECCLESIASTICA* and the *VITA CUTHBERTI*) are relatively few. Bede's work suffered the same fate as many other pre-1100 insular MSS. The Viking invasions and cultural decay brought about general destruction; in addition, his school texts were particularly vulnerable to abuse, hard wear, and eventual discard. Manuscript evidence suggests that most of Bede's works were re-imported into England after the Conquest.

Bede's influence generally permeates the writings of the educated class in Anglo-Saxon England, but it is difficult to establish always when authors are borrowing from him, since sometimes Bede is the intermediary source for a late antique or patristic idea or quotation which they may have gotten directly or from another intermediary, and sometimes authors incorporate material from him in a reworked fashion that conceals the full extent of indebtedness to him. As a rule, if an Anglo-Saxon author undertakes

a topic Bede has written on, Bede is a likely source for at least some of it; it is fruitless to seek Bede in treatments of non-canonical and pseudopigraphal topics.

For a detailed treatment of Bede's life, see G. Brown (1987).

[For this *Trial Version*, only the headnote for one of Bede's didactic works has been included.]

De orthographia [BEDA.Orthogr.]: *CPL* 1566.

MSS 1. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 221: HG 69.

2. London, BL Harley 3826: HG 438.

Lists none.

A-S Vers none.

Quots/Cits 1. ALCVIN.Orthogr.: see below.

2. ? BONIFGramm.: see below.

Refs none.

George H. Brown

OLD ENGLISH BEDE (*Bede*, B9.6).

MSS 1. Cambridge, University Library Kk.3.18: HG 22.

2. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41: HG 39.

3. London, BL, Cotton Otho B.xi: HG 357.

4. London, BL, Cotton Domitian ix, fol. 11: HG 330.

5. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner 10 (*SC* 9830): HG 668.

6. Oxford, Corpus Christi College 279 part ii: HG 673.

Lists—A-S Vers none.

Quots/Cits 1. *ÆCHom* II.9 (B1.2.10) 57–58: *Bede* 96.10–11.

2. *ÆCHom* II.9 (B1.2.10) 77–78: *Bede* 96.31–32.

Refs *ÆCHom* II.9 (B1.2.10) 7–8.

The Old English *Bede* is a shortened vernacular version of BEDE's *HISTORIA ECCLESIASTICA*: the translator edits Bede's work, consistently omitting most epitaphs, poems, letters, and other documents, many geographical details, and much historical information about the Church which does not directly affect England; see Whitelock (*GR* 5587, pp 61–62). Excerpts were copied into MS Cotton Domitian ix, fol 11 around 900 (*NRK* 151). The Tanner MS is from the first quarter of the tenth century (*NRK* 351). Cot-